

ORAL ARGUMENT SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 2, 2016

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

<hr/>		)	
State of West Virginia, et al.,		)	
		)	
<i>Petitioners,</i>		)	
		)	No. 15-1363 and
v.		)	consolidated cases
		)	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, et al.,		)	
		)	
<i>Respondents.</i>		)	
<hr/>		)	

**PROPOSED BRIEFING FORMAT AND SCHEDULE OF PETITIONERS  
AND PETITIONER-INTERVENORS**

On January 21, 2016, the Court issued an order directing the parties to submit a briefing proposal for “all of the issues in these cases” by noon on January 27, 2016. ECF No. 1594951. The parties have conferred and have been unable to agree on a proposed format and schedule for briefing in these cases. This pleading sets forth the briefing proposal of the undersigned Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors for the Court’s consideration.

This consolidated case involves 39 separate petitions for review by 157 separate Petitioners, including 27 States, of a final rule promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) that establishes carbon dioxide emission performance rates for coal- and gas-fired electric generating units. 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23,

2015). Those performance rates are then used to calculate emission performance requirements for 47 of the 50 States. Each of these States must submit a plan to EPA setting forth how it will restructure the power sector within the State to meet its emission reduction requirement. EPA claims that the rule is authorized under section 111(d), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d), of the Clean Air Act (“CAA” or “Act”). EPA has relied on this section of the CAA only a handful of times in the history of the Act and has never issued a rule of this scope or magnitude under this provision – or, for that matter, any other provision of the Act. The rule requires, through the States, a restructuring of the American electric utility industry that will impact every American in some way if it is implemented. Being mindful of the Court’s admonition that it “looks with extreme disfavor on repetitious submissions . . . and . . . encourage[s] [the parties] to limit both the number and size of the briefs they propose to file,” *id.*, and taking into consideration the unprecedented nature of this case and the numerous issues that need to be raised, Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors propose the following briefing format and schedule:

<b>Document</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Word Limits</b>
State Petitioners’ Opening Brief on Fundamental Legal Issues	February 22, 2016	14,000 words
State Petitioners’ Opening Brief on Record-Based Issues	February 22, 2016	14,000 words

<b>Document</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Word Limits</b>
Non-State Petitioners' Opening Brief on Fundamental Legal Issues	February 22, 2016	14,000 words
Non-State Petitioners' Opening Brief on Record-Based Issues	February 22, 2016	14,000 words
Joint Brief of Petitioner-Intervenors	February 25, 2016	10,000 words
Amici Briefs in Support of Petitioners	February 29, 2016	To be determined by Court
EPA's Response Brief	March 25, 2016	56,000 words
Joint Brief of Respondent-Intervenors	March 28, 2016	10,000 words
Amici Briefs in Support of Respondents	April 1, 2016	To be determined by Court
State Petitioners' Reply Brief on Fundamental Legal Issues	April 15, 2016	7,000 words
State Petitioners' Reply Brief on Record-Based Issues	April 15, 2016	7,000 words
Non-State Petitioners' Reply Brief on Fundamental Legal Issues	April 15, 2016	7,000 words
Non-State Petitioners' Reply Brief on Record-Based Issues	April 15, 2016	7,000 words
Petitioner-Intervenors' Reply Brief	April 15, 2016	5,000 words
Deferred Joint Appendix	April 18, 2016	N/A
Final Briefs	April 22, 2016	N/A

Given the scope, complexity, and sheer number of issues involved in this case, Petitioners' and Petitioner-Intervenors' proposal requests the minimum number of words required to ensure that *all* of this diverse group of Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors obtain meaningful judicial review. Given EPA's unprecedented interpretation of its authority under section 111(d), State and Non-State Petitioners each need full-length briefs to address whether EPA has authority to adopt the rule. Beyond those fundamental, overarching issues, the rule raises a very large number of record-based issues that must also be resolved. These record-based issues include those listed in Attachment A (record-based issues of State Petitioners) and in Attachment B (record-based issues of Non-State Petitioners). The large number of record-based issues present in this case arises from a number of factors.

Foremost, the rule is lengthy and complex. EPA's rule and its supporting documents span thousands of pages. The rule itself is more than 300 pages of the Federal Register and is supported by a regulatory impact analysis of more than 300 pages and a 152-page legal memorandum.<sup>1</sup> The rule's emission performance rates and state-by-state "mass-based" and "rate-based" requirements are the product of a complicated grid-wide analysis explained in a 50-page CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Performance Rate and Goal Computation Technical Support Document and a 124-page

---

<sup>1</sup> The technical support documents and modeling for the rule are available at <http://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/clean-power-plan-final-rule-technical-documents>.

Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures Technical Support Document. Moreover, these rates and goals were the product of extensive computer modeling and remodeling of the power grid based on a myriad of technical assumptions. The comments on the rule were so extensive that EPA's Response to Comments document consumed 7,565 pages. Given the extensive record, the number of documents, and the complexity of the assumptions and calculations that undergird the rule, it is unsurprising that Petitioners have a large number of issues that relate to whether aspects of the rule are arbitrary and capricious.

Further complexity results from the fact that the rule affects each State and each electric generator within each State differently depending on the stringency of the different emission reduction requirement each State faces, that State's current mix of electric generating resources, the ability of the State to develop new renewable energy generation, each State's transmission interconnections with other States to import and export power, the size and type of the affected electric generators, the generation resources available to each electric generator owner and operator, and a host of other State- and utility-specific factors. This is not a matter of a single legal flaw in the rule causing different impacts in different States. Under section 111(a)(1)(A) of the CAA, standards of performance for stationary sources must be based on the "best system of emission reduction" that is "adequately demonstrated" considering compliance cost and other factors, and those standards of performance that result from this emission-reduction system for a source must be "achievable."

What may be adequately demonstrated, cost-effective, and achievable for sources in one State may not be for sources in another State, depending on State-specific factors. Texas, for instance, must have an opportunity to demonstrate that transmission constraints within its borders caused by its intrastate grid, which is unique as compared to the rest of the contiguous United States, render the rule unachievable in a way that might not be the case in another State.

Yet further complexity stems from the nature of electric generation throughout the country and how the electric grid works. Electric utilities and generation companies are numerous, diverse, and unique. Some are large multistate, vertically-integrated utilities that own many different kinds of electric generating stations. Many more are very small municipalities that own only a single facility. Still others are cooperatives that operate in rural areas. Some are located in windy or sunny areas of the country and have access to renewable resources, but some are not. A large number of power plants are now owned by independent power producers, which only sell power at wholesale. Much of the population of the country is served by utilities that operate in “organized markets” run by regional transmission operators or independent system operators that operate electric transmission systems and dispatch power across those systems. But some of the population is served by utilities that still own and operate their own generation and transmission systems and use those systems to serve their retail customers. There is also a dual system of electric utility regulation, with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulating interstate

transmission and wholesale transactions and State agencies regulating everything else, including retail sales to the public. All of this complexity generates a host of utility- and State-specific issues stemming from EPA's assertion that its best system of emission reduction, the foundation of which is the nationwide electric grid as a whole, is adequately demonstrated, cost-justified, or even feasible for specific States, regions of the country, and electricity providers.

Finally, it should be noted that the word limits sought by Petitioners are in line with – and actually less than – the limits imposed by this Court in similar CAA cases. The closest example to this case is this Court's review of EPA's initial suite of greenhouse gas rules that established greenhouse gas emission standards for motor vehicles and triggered regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources through the Act's Title V and prevention of significant deterioration permitting programs. *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102 (D.C. Cir. 2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part sub nom. Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014). Those cases were argued over two days, as the Court has indicated is possible in this case. ECF No. 1594951. In *Coalition for Responsible Regulation*, petitioners and their supporting intervenors had a total of 108,000 words.<sup>2</sup> See ECF No. 1299368 (endangerment finding; 30,000 words for opening briefs; 15,000 words for reply);

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court actually provided 115,500 total words but one petitioner, which had been provided a separate opening brief and reply totaling 7,500 words, decided not to file a brief.

ECF No. 1299440 (motor vehicle greenhouse gas emission standards; 14,000 words for opening briefs; 7,000 words for reply); ECF No. 1299257 (timing rule and tailoring rule; 28,000 words for opening briefs; 14,000 words for reply). Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors here seek 99,000 words in total, fewer words than were allocated in *Coalition for Responsible Regulation*. Further, Petitioners propose to split their proposed words evenly between State and non-State entities.

Fewer words than those proposed here would effectively deprive Petitioners of their right to judicial review. The judicial review provision of the CAA reflects a congressional decision to allow “preenforcement review of agency rules and regulations.” *Clean Air Implementation Project v. EPA*, 150 F.3d 1200, 1204 (D.C. Cir. 1998). That congressional directive can be given effect only by allowing a meaningful opportunity to present all issues. Moreover, this Court has made clear that issues must be raised with specificity. *White Stallion Energy Ctr., LLC v. EPA*, 748 F.3d 1222, 1251 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (“[C]ursory treatment is inadequate to place [a] challenge . . . before the court, because ‘it is not enough merely to mention a possible argument in the most skeletal way, leaving the court to do counsel’s work, create the ossature for the argument, and put flesh on its bones.’”) (quoting *Davis v. Pension Benefit Guar. Corp.*, 734 F.3d 1161, 1166-67 (D.C. Cir. 2013)). Given the number of issues that exist in this case, and the Court’s directive that all the issues must be briefed, the word limits proposed here by Petitioners are necessary to ensure meaningful judicial review and due process.



Specifically, the fundamental legal issues that Petitioners seek to raise are:

**State Petitioners' Fundamental Legal Issues:**

1. Whether the rule, which regulates existing power plants under CAA § 111(d) is unlawful because EPA has regulated the same power plants under CAA § 112;
2. Whether EPA's interpretation of CAA § 111(d) to grant it the authority to force States to transform their energy economies to favor only certain sources of electricity is consistent with the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014);
3. Whether the rule is contrary to law because it invades the traditional authority of States over electricity generation and intrastate electricity transmission as recognized by the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. § 824 et seq., in violation of that Act and/or in excess of the power delegated to EPA under the CAA;
4. Whether the rule is contrary to law because it prescribes inflexible state-specific emission limits that each State must achieve, rather than the procedures for States to use in establishing standards of performance as authorized by CAA § 111(d)(1); and
5. Whether the rule's reliance on actions by State and their officials, as well as its inherent threats to electric reliability and affordability, exceeds the powers of the federal government and impinges on powers reserved to the States by the Tenth Amendment.

**Non-State Petitioners' Fundamental Legal Issues:**

1. Whether the rule violates section 111 of the CAA by:
  - a. Requiring that States adopt standards of performance for carbon dioxide emissions from existing coal- and natural gas-fired electric generating units that are not based on air pollution controls that can be implemented at any such unit, but instead require the curtailment or closure of such sources and replacement of their generation by EPA-preferred facilities, including many outside the regulated source category;
  - b. Requiring States to adopt standards that do not continuously limit the rate at which the regulated pollutant is emitted by regulated sources through technological or operational processes that can be installed or implemented at the individual source;
  - c. Requiring States to establish standards for *existing* units that are more stringent than those EPA contemporaneously established under section 111(b) as the best achievable even for state-of-the-art *new* units; and
  - d. Depriving States of their authority “to take into consideration, among other factors, the remaining useful life” of an existing source when applying a standard of performance to that source; and
2. Whether EPA has contradicted basic rules of statutory construction by asserting authority to transform the power sector, without clear congressional

authorization or the necessary expertise and in a manner that would intrude on the jurisdiction of State governments.

In addition, as discussed above, Petitioners also have numerous record-based issues regarding the rule. These issues are complex, myriad, and sometimes highly specific to a source or State. The list of the record-based issues that the States plan on raising include those listed in Attachment A, and the list of record-based issues that the non-state Petitioners plan on raising include those listed in Attachment B. Given the sheer number of issues listed, the request for a full-length, 14,000 word brief for each set of these record-based issues is modest, and Petitioners will have an extremely limited number of words to address each issue and may even need to forgo raising some of them.

Petitioner-Intervenors should also be granted a separate brief. In their motions to intervene, Petitioner-Intervenors showed that they have distinct interests in this proceeding and have met the standard for showing that the existing parties do not adequately represent their interests. Petitioner-Intervenors, which are represented by Professor Laurence Tribe, plan on expanding on the constitutional and statutory construction issues raised in Petitioners' briefs as follows:

1. Petitioner-Intervenors will expand on the States' argument that EPA has no authority to regulate sources under section 111(d) if those sources are also regulated under section 112. In particular, Petitioner-Intervenors will argue that even if there were two "versions" of section 111(d) (and there are not, as the States will

argue), EPA lacks the authority under separation of powers principles to decide which “version” to make legally operative.

2. Petitioner-Intervenors will present additional arguments regarding the fact that the rule offends principles of federalism and violates the Tenth Amendment. Specifically, Petitioner-Intervenors will focus on why the violations of the structural protections of federalism threaten individual liberty. The Supreme Court has held that private parties as well as States can invoke the protections of federalism. *Bond v. United States*, 131 S. Ct. 2355, 2364 (2011).

3. Petitioner-Intervenors will further develop arguments regarding the impact of the rule on the coal industry, with a focus on the unconstitutionality of the rule as applied to Petitioner-Intervenors. They will show, for example, that the rule raises serious constitutional questions under the Fifth Amendment that could be avoided by a proper statutory construction of the CAA and that the rule is invalid because EPA failed to properly consider costs and benefits and violated the mandate of *Michigan v. EPA*, 135 S. Ct. 2699 (2015).

Petitioner-Intervenors are well aware of this Court’s rules against duplication and will not file briefing that is redundant of Petitioners’ submissions. Petitioner-Intervenors are asking only for permission to file a 10,000 word brief (18 percent of the total words Petitioners seek). This is the absolute minimum number of words Petitioner-Intervenors deem necessary to address the critically important issues EPA’s rule raises. Petitioner-Intervenors understand that Respondent-Intervenors plan on

seeking far more words – fully 62.5 percent of the total words allocated to EPA.

Although Petitioner-Intervenors think that is excessive, they believe the Court should abide by a principle of parity, allowing Petitioner-Intervenors an equal number of words to whatever it grants Respondent-Intervenors.

With regard to the briefing schedule, the Court has ordered that reply briefs must be filed by April 15, 2016, or 79 days from today. ECF No. 1594951. The schedule proposed in this case is based on a distribution of those days consistent with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. In an ordinary case under the Rules, each party would have an equal amount of time to file their respective opening briefs (e.g., 30 days each) and the petitioner/appellant would then have half that time to file a reply brief (e.g., 15 days). In total, the petitioner/appellant would have 3/5 of the total days (e.g., 45 days), and the respondent/appellee would have 2/5 (e.g., 30 days). Following that distribution, Petitioners are proposing that they have 47 of the 79 total days (roughly 3/5) and EPA have 32 (roughly 2/5). The proposed schedule allots 26 of Petitioners' 48 days for opening briefs and 21 days for replies.

It is particularly important that Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors have at least three weeks from the time EPA files its brief to ensure there is enough time for adequate coordination, particularly among the 27 States that are parties and that have unique review and approval requirements for judicial filings. Even among the Non-State Petitioners, coordination is difficult simply because of the sheer number of parties and counsel. Moreover, time for coordination between State Petitioners, Non-

State Petitioners, and Petitioner-Intervenors is needed to avoid duplication and repetition. Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors understand that EPA may advocate for its brief to be due just two weeks before the April 15, 2016 deadline for reply briefs, with multiple Respondent-Intervenor briefs being due after that. Such a schedule would not give Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors adequate time to prepare reply briefs.

For all these reasons, Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors respectfully request that the Court adopt the briefing format and schedule proposed herein.

Dated: January 27, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott A. Keller

Ken Paxton

Attorney General of Texas

Charles E. Roy

First Assistant Attorney General

Scott A. Keller

Solicitor General

*Counsel of Record*

P.O. Box 12548

Austin, TX 78711-2548

Tel: (512) 936-1700

scott.keller@texasattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Texas*

/s/ Elbert Lin

Patrick Morrissey

Attorney General of West

Virginia

Elbert Lin

Solicitor General

*Counsel of Record*

J. Zak Ritchie

Assistant Attorney General

State Capitol Building 1, Room 26-E

Charleston, WV 25305

Tel: (304) 558-2021

Fax: (304) 558-0140

elbert.lin@wvago.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of West Virginia*

/s/ Andrew Brasher

Luther Strange  
Attorney General of Alabama  
Andrew Brasher  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
501 Washington Avenue  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel: (334) 590-1029  
abrasher@ago.state.al.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Alabama*

/s/ Jamie L. Ewing

Leslie Rutledge  
Attorney General of Arkansas  
Lee Rudofsky  
Solicitor General  
Jamie L. Ewing  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
323 Center Street, Suite 400  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 682-5310  
jamie.ewing@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Arkansas*

/s/ John R. Lopez IV

Mark Brnovich  
Attorney General of Arizona  
John R. Lopez IV  
*Counsel of Record*  
Dominic E. Draye  
Keith Miller  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Maureen Scott  
Janet Wagner  
Janice Alward  
Arizona Corp. Commission,  
Staff Attorneys  
1275 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Tel: (602) 542-5025  
john.lopez@azag.gov  
dominic.draye@azag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Corporation  
Commission*

/s/ Frederick Yarger

Cynthia H. Coffman  
Attorney General of Colorado  
Frederick Yarger  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: (720) 508-6168  
fred.yarger@state.co.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Colorado*

/s/ Allen Winsor

Pamela Jo Bondi  
Attorney General of Florida  
Allen Winsor  
Solicitor General of Florida  
*Counsel of Record*  
Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050  
Tel: (850) 414-3681  
Fax: (850) 410-2672  
allen.winsor@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Florida*

/s/ Timothy Junk

Gregory F. Zoeller  
Attorney General of Indiana  
Timothy Junk  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Indiana Government Ctr. South  
Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46205  
Tel: (317) 232-6247  
tim.junk@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Indiana*

/s/ Britt C. Grant

Samuel S. Olenz  
Attorney General of Georgia  
Britt C. Grant  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
40 Capitol Square S.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
Tel: (404) 656-3300  
Fax: (404) 463-9453  
bgrant@law.ga.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Georgia*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Chanay

Derek Schmidt  
Attorney General of Kansas  
Jeffrey A. Chanay  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Bryan C. Clark  
Assistant Solicitor General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Tel: (785) 368-8435  
Fax: (785) 291-3767  
jeff.chanay@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Kansas*



/s/ Gregory T. Dutton

Andy Beshear  
Attorney General of Kentucky  
Gregory T. Dutton  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
700 Capital Avenue  
Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
Tel: (502) 696-5453  
gregory.dutton@ky.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Kentucky*

/s/ Donald Trahan

Herman Robinson  
Executive Counsel  
Donald Trahan  
*Counsel of Record*  
Elliott Vega  
Louisiana Department of Environmental  
Quality  
Legal Division  
P.O. Box 4302  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4302  
Tel: (225) 219-3985  
Fax: (225) 219-4068  
donald.trahan@la.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana  
Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Steven B. "Beaux" Jones

Jeff Landry  
Attorney General of Louisiana  
Steven B. "Beaux" Jones  
*Counsel of Record*  
Duncan S. Kemp, IV  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Environmental Section – Civil Division  
1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
Tel: (225) 326-6085  
Fax: (225) 326-6099  
jonesst@ag.state.la.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana*

/s/ Aaron D. Lindstrom

Bill Schuette  
Attorney General for the People  
of Michigan  
Aaron D. Lindstrom  
Michigan Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Tel: (515) 373-1124  
Fax: (517) 373-3042  
lindstroma@michigan.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

/s/ Harold E. Pizzetta, III  
Jim Hood  
Attorney General of the State of  
Mississippi  
Harold E. Pizzetta  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Litigation Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, MS 39205  
Tel: (601) 359-3816  
Fax: (601) 359-2003  
hpizz@ago.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Mississippi*

/s/ Todd E. Palmer  
Todd E. Palmer  
Valeria L. Green  
Michael, Best & Friedrich LLP  
601 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2601  
Tel: (202) 747-9560  
Fax: (202) 347-1819  
tepalmer@michaelbest.com  
vlgreen@michaelbest.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Public Service  
Commission*

/s/ Donna J. Hodges  
Donna J. Hodges  
Senior Counsel  
Mississippi Department of  
Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 2261  
Jackson, MS 39225-2261  
Tel: (601) 961-5369  
Fax: (601) 961-5349  
donna\_hodges@deq.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Department of  
Environmental Quality*

/s/ James R. Layton  
Chris Koster  
Attorney General of Missouri  
James R. Layton  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 899  
207 W. High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
Tel: (573) 751-1800  
Fax: (573) 751-0774  
james.layton@ago.mo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Missouri*

/s/ Dale Schowengerdt  
Timothy C. Fox  
Attorney General of Montana  
Alan Joscelyn  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Dale Schowengerdt  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
215 North Sanders  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
Tel: (406) 444-7008  
dales@mt.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Montana*

/s/ Robert J. Kinney  
John J. Hoffman  
Acting Attorney General of New  
Jersey  
David C. Apy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Robert J. Kinney  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Division of Law  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
P.O. Box 093  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093  
Tel: (609) 292-6945  
Fax: (609) 341-5030  
robert.kinney@dol.lps.state.nj.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of New Jersey*

/s/ Justin D. Lavene  
Doug Peterson  
Attorney General of Nebraska  
Dave Bydlaek  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Justin D. Lavene  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Tel: (402) 471-2834  
justin.lavene@nebraska.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Nebraska*

/s/ Paul M. Seby  
Wayne Stenehjem  
Attorney General of North  
Dakota  
Margaret Olson  
Assistant Attorney General  
North Dakota Attorney General's Office  
600 E. Boulevard Avenue #125  
Bismarck, ND 58505  
Tel: (701) 328-3640  
maiolson@nd.gov

Paul M. Seby  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
State of North Dakota  
Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
1200 17th Street, Suite 2400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 572-6500  
Fax: (303) 572-6540  
sebyp@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of North Dakota*

/s/ Eric E. Murphy  
Michael DeWine  
Attorney General of Ohio  
Eric E. Murphy  
State Solicitor  
*Counsel of Record*  
30 E. Broad Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 466-8980  
eric.murphy@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Ohio*

/s/ David B. Rivkin, Jr.  
E. Scott Pruitt  
Attorney General of Oklahoma  
Patrick R. Wyrick  
Solicitor General  
313 N.E. 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Tel: (405) 521-4396  
Fax: (405) 522-0669  
fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us  
scott.pruitt@oag.ok.gov

David B. Rivkin, Jr.  
*Counsel of Record*  
Mark W. DeLaquil  
Andrew M. Grossman  
Baker & Hostetler LLP  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 861-1731  
Fax: (202) 861-1783  
drivkin@bakerlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners State of Oklahoma and  
Oklahoma Department of Environmental  
Quality*

/s/ James Emory Smith, Jr.

Alan Wilson  
Attorney General of South  
Carolina

Robert D. Cook  
Solicitor General

James Emory Smith, Jr.  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*

P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
Tel: (803) 734-3680  
Fax: (803) 734-3677  
esmith@scag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Carolina*

/s/ Tyler R. Green

Sean Reyes  
Attorney General of Utah  
Tyler R. Green  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*

Parker Douglas  
Federal Solicitor  
Utah State Capitol Complex  
350 North State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320  
pdouglas@utah.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Utah*

/s/ Steven R. Blair

Marty J. Jackley  
Attorney General of South  
Dakota

Steven R. Blair  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*

1302 E. Highway 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Tel: (605) 773-3215  
steven.blair@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Dakota*

/s/ Misha Tseytlin

Brad Schimel  
Attorney General of Wisconsin  
Misha Tseytlin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*

Andrew Cook  
Deputy Attorney General  
Delanie M. Breuer  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 West Main Street  
Madison, WI 53707  
Tel: (608) 267-9323  
tseytlinm@doj.state.wi.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

/s/ James Kaste

Peter K. Michael

Attorney General of Wyoming

James Kaste

Deputy Attorney General

*Counsel of Record*

Michael J. McGrady

Erik Petersen

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Elizabeth Morrisseau

Assistant Attorneys General

2320 Capitol Avenue

Cheyenne, WY 82002

Tel: (307) 777-6946

Fax: (307) 777-3542

james.kaste@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wyoming*

/s/ Sam M. Hayes

Sam M. Hayes

General Counsel

*Counsel of Record*

Craig Bromby

Deputy General Counsel

Andrew Norton

Deputy General Counsel

North Carolina Department of

Environmental Quality

1601 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699-1601

Tel: (919) 707-8616

sam.hayes@ncdenr.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner North Carolina*

*Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Allison D. Wood

F. William Brownell

Allison D. Wood

Henry V. Nickel

Tauna M. Szymanski

Hunton & Williams LLP

2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20037

Tel: (202) 955-1500

bbrownell@hunton.com

awood@hunton.com

hnickel@hunton.com

tszymanski@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Utility Air Regulatory*

*Group and American Public Power Association*

Stacey Turner  
Southern Company Services, Inc.  
600 18<sup>th</sup> Street North  
BIN 14N-8195  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 257-2823  
staturner@southernco.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Alabama Power  
Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power  
Company, and Mississippi Power Company*

/s/ Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Angela J. Levin  
Troutman Sanders LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
margaret.campbell@troutmansanders.com  
angela.levin@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Georgia Power Company*

/s/ C. Grady Moore, III  
C. Grady Moore, III  
Steven G. McKinney  
Balch & Bingham LLP  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35303-4642  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
Fax: (205) 488-5704  
gmoore@balch.com  
smckinney@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Alabama Power  
Company*

/s/ Terese T. Wyly  
Terese T. Wyly  
Ben H. Stone  
Balch & Bingham LLP  
1310 Twenty Fifth Avenue  
Gulfport, MS 39501-1931  
Tel: (228) 214-0413  
twyly@balch.com  
bstone@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Power  
Company*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Stone \_\_\_\_\_

Jeffrey A. Stone  
Beggs & Lane, RLLP  
501 Commendencia Street  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Tel: (850) 432-2451  
JAS@beggslane.com

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Gulf Power Company*

/s/ Christina F. Gomez \_\_\_\_\_

Christina F. Gomez  
Lawrence E. Volmert  
Garrison W. Kaufman  
Jill H. Van Noord  
Holland & Hart LLP  
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 295-8000  
Fax: (303) 295-8261  
cgomez@hollandhart.com  
lvolmert@hollandhart.com  
gwkaufman@hollandhart.com  
jhvan Noord@hollandhart.com

Patrick R. Day  
Holland & Hart LLP  
2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450  
Cheyenne, WY 82001  
Tel: (307) 778-4200  
Fax: (307) 778-8175  
pday@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
Holland & Hart LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5800  
Fax: (801) 799-5700  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Basin Electric Power  
Cooperative*



/s/ James S. Alves

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner CO<sub>2</sub> Task Force of the  
Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, Inc.*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

Kelly McQueen  
Entergy Services, Inc.  
425 W. Capitol Avenue, 27th Floor  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 377-5760  
kmcque1@entergy.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Entergy Corporation*

/s/ John J. McMackin

John J. McMackin  
Williams & Jensen  
701 8th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 659-8201  
jjmcmackin@wms-jen.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy-Intensive  
Manufacturers Working Group on Greenhouse  
Gas Regulation*

/s/ Paul J. Zidlicky

Paul J. Zidlicky  
Sidley Austin, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8000  
pzidlicky@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners GenOn Mid-Atlantic,  
LLC; Indian River Power LLC; Louisiana  
Generating LLC; Midwest Generation, LLC;  
NRG Chalk Point LLC; NRG Power  
Midwest LP; NRG Rema LLC; NRG Texas  
Power LLC; NRG Wholesale Generation LP;  
and Vienna Power LLC*

/s/ David M. Flannery

David M. Flannery  
Kathy G. Beckett  
Edward L. Kropp  
Step toe & Johnson, PLLC  
505 Virginia Street East  
Charleston, WV 25326  
Tel: (304) 353-8000  
dave.flannery@steptoe-johnson.com  
kathy.beckett@steptoe-johnson.com  
skipp.kropp@steptoe-johnson.com

Stephen L. Miller  
Step toe & Johnson, PLLC  
700 N. Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 115  
Louisville, KY 40222  
Tel: (502) 423-2000  
steve.miller@steptoe-johnson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Indiana Utility Group*

/s/ F. William Brownell

F. William Brownell  
Eric J. Murdock  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@hunton.com  
emurdock@hunton.com

Nash E. Long III  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
Bank of America Plaza, Suite 3500  
101 South Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
Tel: (704) 378-4700  
nlong@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner LG&E and KU Energy  
LLC*

/s/ P. Stephen Gidiere III

P. Stephen Gidiere III  
Thomas L. Casey III  
Julia B. Barber  
Balch & Bingham LLP  
1901 6th Ave. N., Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
sgidiere@balch.com

Stephanie Z. Moore  
Vice President and General Counsel  
Luminant Generation Company LLC  
1601 Bryan Street, 22nd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

Daniel J. Kelly  
Vice President and Associate General  
Counsel  
Energy Future Holdings Corp.  
1601 Bryan Street, 43rd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

*Counsel for Petitioners Luminant Generation  
Company LLC; Oak Grove Management  
Company LLC; Big Brown Power Company  
LLC; Sandow Power Company LLC; Big  
Brown Lignite Company LLC; Luminant  
Mining Company LLC; and Luminant Big  
Brown Mining Company LLC*

/s/ Ronald J. Tenpas

Ronald J. Tenpas  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
rtenpas@morganlewis.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Minnesota Power (an  
operating division of ALLETE, Inc.)*

/s/ Allison D. Wood

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Montana-Dakota Utilities  
Co., a Division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.*

/s/ Joshua R. More

Joshua R. More  
Jane E. Montgomery  
Amy Antonioli  
Raghav Murali  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 6600  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 258-5500  
jmore@schiffhardin.com  
jmontgomery@schiffhardin.com  
aantonioli@schiffhardin.com  
rmurali@schiffhardin.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Prairie State Generating  
Company, LLC*

*Of Counsel*

Rae Cronmiller  
Environmental Counsel  
National Association of Rural Electric  
Cooperatives  
4301 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 907-5500  
rae.cronmiller@nreca.coop

/s/ Thomas A. Lorenzen

Thomas A. Lorenzen  
D.C. Cir. Bar No. 394369  
Daniel W. Wolff  
Sherrie A. Armstrong  
Crowell & Moring LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 624-2500  
tlorenzen@crowell.com  
dwolff@crowell.com  
sarmstrong@crowell.com

*Counsel for Petitioners National Rural Electric  
Cooperative Association; Big Rivers Electric  
Corporation; Brazos Electric Power Cooperative,  
Inc.; Buckeye Power, Inc.; Central Montana  
Electric Power Cooperative; Central Power  
Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corn Belt Power  
Cooperative; Dairyland Power Cooperative;  
East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.;  
Georgia Transmission Corporation; Kansas  
Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; North  
Carolina Electric Membership Corporation;  
Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative; Oglethorpe  
Power Corporation; PowerSouth Energy  
Cooperative; Prairie Power, Inc.; Rushmore  
Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Seminole  
Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Southern Illinois  
Power Cooperative; Sunflower Electric Power  
Corporation; and Upper Missouri G. & T.  
Electric Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Eric L. Hiser

Eric L. Hiser  
 Jordan Bischoff & Hiser, PLC  
 7272 E. Indian School Road, Suite 360  
 Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
 Tel: (480) 505-3927  
 ehiser@jordenbischoff.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Electric Power  
 Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Christopher L. Bell

Christopher L. Bell  
 Greenberg Traurig LLP  
 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700  
 Houston, TX 77002  
 Tel: (713) 374-3556  
 belc@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Golden Spread Electrical  
 Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ John M. Holloway III

John M. Holloway III, DC Bar # 494459  
 Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP  
 700 Sixth Street, N.W., Suite 700  
 Washington, D.C. 20001  
 Tel: (202) 383-0100  
 Fax: (202) 383-3593  
 jay.holloway@sutherland.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Kentucky Power  
 Cooperative, Inc.; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric  
 Cooperative, Inc.; Minnkota Power Cooperative,  
 Inc.; and South Mississippi Electric Power  
 Association*

/s/ Brian A. Prestwood

Brian A. Prestwood  
 Senior Corporate and Compliance  
 Counsel  
 Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc.  
 2814 S. Golden, P.O. Box 754  
 Springfield, MO 65801  
 Tel: (417) 885-9273  
 bprestwood@aeci.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Associated Electric  
 Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ David Crabtree

David Crabtree  
 Vice President, General Counsel  
 Deseret Generation & Transmission Co-  
 operative  
 10714 South Jordan Gateway  
 South Jordan, UT 84095  
 Tel: (801) 619-9500  
 Crabtree@deseretpower.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Deseret Generation &  
 Transmission Co-operative*

/s/ Patrick Burchette

Patrick Burchette  
 Holland & Knight LLP  
 800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
 Washington, D.C. 20006  
 Tel: (202) 469-5102  
 Patrick.Burchette@hklaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Texas Electric  
 Cooperative, Inc.; Northeast Texas Electric  
 Cooperative, Inc.; Sam Rayburn G&T Electric  
 Cooperative, Inc.; and Tex-La Electric  
 Cooperative of Texas, Inc.*

/s/ Mark Walters

Mark Walters  
D.C. Cir. Bar No. 54161  
Michael J. Nasi  
D.C. Cir. Bar No. 53850  
Jackson Walker L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 236-2000  
mwalters@jw.com  
mnasi@jw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners San Miguel Electric  
Cooperative, Inc. and South Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Western Farmers Electric  
Cooperative*

/s/ Randolph G. Holt

Randolph G. Holt  
Jeremy L. Fetty  
Parr Richey Obremskey Frandsen &  
Patterson LLP  
Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.  
722 N. High School Road  
P.O. Box 24700  
Indianapolis, IN 46224  
Tel: (317) 481-2815  
R\_holt@wvpa.com  
jfetty@parrlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wabash Valley Power  
Association, Inc.*

/s/ Steven C. Kohl

Steven C. Kohl  
Gaetan Gerville-Reache  
Warner Norcross & Judd LLP  
2000 Town Center, Suite 2700  
Southfield, MI 48075-1318  
Tel: (248) 784-5000  
skohl@wnj.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wolverine Power Supply  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner NorthWestern  
Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Westar Energy, Inc.*

/s/ Allison D. Wood

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Tri-State Generation and  
Transmission Association, Inc.*

/s/ Peter S. Glaser

Peter S. Glaser  
Troutman Sanders LLP  
401 Ninth Street N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 274-2998  
peter.glaser@troutmansanders.com

Carroll W. McGuffey III  
Justin T. Wong  
Troutman Sanders LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
mack.mcguffey@troutmansanders.com  
justin.wong@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Mining  
Association*



/s/ Jeffrey R. Holmstead

Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Sandra Y. Snyder  
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP  
2000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1872  
Tel: (202) 828-5852  
Fax: (202) 857-4812  
jeff.holmstead@bglp.com

*Counsel for Petitioner American Coalition for  
Clean Coal Electricity*

/s/ Andrew C. Emrich

Andrew C. Emrich  
Holland & Hart LLP  
6380 South Fiddlers Green Circle  
Suite 500  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
Tel: (303) 290-1621  
Fax: (866) 711-8046  
acemrich@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
Holland & Hart LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5753  
Fax: (202) 747-6574  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Newmont Nevada  
Energy Investment, LLC and Newmont USA  
Limited*

/s/ Geoffrey K. Barnes

Geoffrey K. Barnes  
J. Van Carson  
Wendlene M. Lavey  
John D. Lazzaretti  
Robert D. Cheren  
Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP  
4900 Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Tel: (216) 479-8646  
geoffrey.barnes@squirepb.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Murray Energy  
Corporation*

/s/ Charles T. Wehland

Charles T. Wehland  
*Counsel of Record*  
Brian J. Murray  
Jones Day  
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3500  
Chicago, IL 60601-1692  
Tel: (312) 782-3939  
Fax: (312) 782-8585  
ctwehland@jonesday.com  
bjmurray@jonesday.com

*Counsel for Petitioners The North American  
Coal Corporation; The Coteau Properties  
Company; Coyote Creek Mining Company,  
LLC; The Falkirk Mining Company;  
Mississippi Lignite Mining Company; North  
American Coal Royalty Company; NODAK  
Energy Services, LLC; Otter Creek Mining  
Company, LLC; and The Sabine Mining  
Company*

/s/ Tristan L. Duncan

Tristan L. Duncan  
Thomas J. Grever  
Justin D. Smith  
Shook Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64018  
Tel: (816) 474-6550  
Fax: (816) 421-5547  
tlduncan@shb.com  
tgrever@shb.com  
jxsmith@shb.com

Laurence H. Tribe  
420 Hauser Hall  
1575 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Tel: (617) 495-1767  
tribe@law.harvard.edu

Jonathan S. Massey  
Massey & Gail, LLP  
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 652-4511  
Fax: (312) 379-0467

*Counsel for Intervenor-Petitioner Peabody Energy  
Corporation*

/s/ Robert G. McLusky

Robert G. McLusky  
Jackson Kelly, PLLC  
1600 Laidley Tower  
P.O. Box 553  
Charleston, WV 25322  
Tel: (304) 340-1000  
rmclusky@jacksonkelly.com

*Counsel for Petitioner West Virginia Coal  
Association*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko  
Eugene M. Trisko  
Law Offices of Eugene M. Trisko  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders,  
Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko  
Eugene M. Trisko  
Law Offices of Eugene M. Trisko  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

/s/ Grant F. Crandall

Grant F. Crandall  
General Counsel  
United Mine Workers of America  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2429  
gcrandall@umwa.org

Arthur Traynor, III  
Staff Counsel  
United Mine Workers of America  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2457  
atraynor@umwa.org

Eugene M. Trisko  
Law Offices of Eugene M. Trisko  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner United Mine Workers of  
America*

/s/ Peter D. Keisler

Peter D. Keisler  
Roger R. Martella, Jr.  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Ryan C. Morris  
Joel F. Visser  
Paul J. Ray  
Sidley Austin, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8027  
pkeisler@sidley.com  
rmartella@sidley.com  
rbeckner@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America; National  
Association of Manufacturers; American Fuel  
& Petrochemical Manufacturers; National  
Federation of Independent Business; American  
Chemistry Council; American Coke and Coal  
Chemicals Institute; American Foundry Society;  
American Forest & Paper Association;  
American Iron & Steel Institute; American  
Wood Council; Brick Industry Association;  
Electricity Consumers Resource Council; Lignite  
Energy Council; National Lime Association;  
National Oilseed Processors Association; and  
Portland Cement Association*

/s/ Steven P. Lehotsky  
Steven P. Lehotsky  
Sheldon B. Gilbert  
U.S. Chamber Litigation Center, Inc.  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062  
Tel: (202) 463-5337  
slehotsky@uschamber.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America*

/s/ Richard S. Moskowitz  
Richard S. Moskowitz  
American Fuel & Petrochemical  
Manufacturers  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 457-0480  
rmoskowitz@afpm.org

*Counsel for Petitioner American Fuel &  
Petrochemical Manufacturers*

/s/ Quentin Riegel  
Linda E. Kelly  
Quentin Riegel  
Manufacturers' Center for Legal Action  
733 10th Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 637-3000  
qriegel@nam.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Manufacturers*

/s/ Karen R. Harned  
Karen R. Harned  
Executive Director  
Elizabeth A. Gaudio  
Senior Executive Counsel  
National Federation of Independent  
Business  
Small Business Legal Center  
1201 F Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 314-2061  
karen.harned@nfib.org  
elizabeth.milito@nfib.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Federation of  
Independent Business*

/s/ Megan H. Berge \_\_\_\_\_

Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Home Builders*

/s/ Kathryn D. Kirmayer \_\_\_\_\_

Kathryn D. Kirmayer  
General Counsel  
Evelyn R. Nackman  
Associate General Counsel  
Association of American Railroads  
425 3rd Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20024  
Tel: (202) 639-2100  
kkirmayer@aar.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Association of American  
Railroads*

/s/ Chaim Mandelbaum  
Chaim Mandelbaum  
Litigation Manager  
Free Market Environmental Law Clinic  
726 N. Nelson Street, Suite 9  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 577-9973  
chaim12@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy and Environment  
Legal Institute*

/s/ Adam R.F. Gustafson  
C. Boyden Gray  
Adam R.F. Gustafson  
*Counsel of Record*  
James R. Conde  
Boyden Gray & Associates, PLLC  
1627 I Street, N.W., #950  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 955-0620  
gustafson@boydengrayassociates.com

Sam Kazman  
Hans Bader  
Competitive Enterprise Institute  
1899 L Street, N.W., 12th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 331-1010

*Counsel for Petitioners Competitive Enterprise  
Institute; Buckeye Institute for Public Policy  
Solutions; Independence Institute; Rio Grande  
Foundation; Sutherland Institute; Klaus J.  
Christoph; Samuel R. Damewood; Catherine C.  
Dellin; Joseph W. Luquire; Lisa R. Markham;  
Patrick T. Peterson; and Kristi Rosenquist*

Robert Alt  
Buckeye Institute for Public Policy  
Solutions  
88 E. Broad Street, Suite 1120  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 224-4422  
robert@buckeyeinstitute.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Buckeye Institute for  
Public Policy Solutions*

/s/ Catherine E. Stetson

Catherine E. Stetson  
Eugene A. Sokoloff  
Hogan Lovells US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1109  
Tel: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com  
eugene.sokoloff@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Denbury Onshore, LLC*

/s/ Dennis Lane

Dennis Lane  
Stinson Leonard Street LLP  
1775 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 785-9100  
Fax: (202) 785-9163  
dennis.lane@stinson.com

Parthenia B. Evans  
Stinson Leonard Street LLP  
1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
Tel: (816) 842-8600  
Fax: (816) 691-3495  
parthy.evans@stinson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Kansas City Board of  
Public Utilities – Unified Government of  
Wyandotte County/ Kansas City, Kansas*



/s/ Mark Walters \_\_\_\_\_

Mark Walters  
Michael Nasi  
Jackson Walker L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 236-2000  
mwalters@jw.com  
mnasi@jw.com

Douglas Bryan Hughes  
Law Offices of D. Bryan Hughes  
701 N. Pacific Street  
Mineola, TX 75773  
Tel: (903) 569-8880  
bryan@hughesfirm.com

*Counsel for Intervenor-Petitioner Gulf Coast  
Lignite Coalition*

/s/ Tristan L. Duncan \_\_\_\_\_

Tristan L. Duncan  
Thomas J. Grever  
Justin D. Smith  
Shook Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64018  
Tel: (816) 474-6550  
Fax: (816) 421-5547  
tlduncan@shb.com  
tgrever@shb.com  
jxsmith@shb.com

Laurence H. Tribe  
420 Hauser Hall  
1575 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Tel: (617) 495-1767  
tribe@law.harvard.edu

Jonathan S. Massey  
Massey & Gail, LLP  
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 652-4511  
Fax: (312) 379-0467

*Counsel for Intervenor-Petitioners Dixon Bros.,  
Inc.; Nelson Brothers, Inc.; Wesco International,  
Inc.; Norfolk Southern Corp.; Joy Global Inc.;  
and Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition*

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**State Petitioners' Record-Based Issues**

1. Whether the Rule's exclusion of certain categories of sources of zero-emission energy and sources of energy efficiency from the special incentives created under the Clean Energy Incentive Program is unlawful.
2. Whether the Rule allowing cap and trade as a compliance option for meeting a "performance standard" is unlawful.
3. Whether the Rule requiring State Plans to regulate new, existing, or modified sources through means which include leakage provisions, set asides, and new source complements is unlawful.
4. Whether the Rule allowing States that choose a mass-based compliance plan to adopt a "state measures approach" and denying this option to States that choose a rate-based compliance plan is unlawful.
5. Whether the Rule's limitations on trading between rate-based and mass-based States are unlawful.
6. Whether the Rule is unlawful and violates due process because fundamental elements critical to the Rule are uncertain or unknown, including technical issues relating to emission rate credits (ERCs), or are currently non-final agency action, including the model trading rules and the federal plan.

7. Whether the Rule's treatment of existing nuclear energy sources in Arkansas, particularly EPA's refusal to provide clean energy credit for Entergy's Arkansas Nuclear One power plant, is unlawful.
8. Whether EPA's failure to consider Florida's unique peninsular geography and the fact that only two States border Florida, thus limiting Florida's power transfer opportunities, is unlawful.
9. Whether EPA's failure to allow Florida to receive credit for decreases in emissions already achieved is unlawful.
10. Whether EPA's assumptions regarding the extent of renewable generation that could be developed in Florida and used to offset emissions from fossil fuel sources without accounting for intricacies and constraints on purchasing renewable energy under Florida law is unlawful.
11. Whether the Rule's failure to provide a method to account meaningfully for over three billion dollars in stranded investments made by Kansas and Mississippi utilities to install criteria pollutant control equipment on power plants in those States, is unlawful.
12. Whether the Rule's failure to provide compliance credit or emission rate credits for New Jersey's pre-2013, multi-billion dollar ratepayer investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and nuclear construction and uprates is unlawful.

13. Whether EPA has the authority to require New Jersey, an energy deregulated State that has chosen to eliminate the traditional retail monopoly structure which electric public utilities had previously held in this State for electric power generation and supply services, to enact a new legislative scheme so that New Jersey can exercise the authority over electric generation facilities that is required to comply with the Clean Power Plan.
14. Whether the Rule's failure to significantly account for the cost of achieving emissions reductions in New Jersey and Mississippi is unlawful.
15. Whether the Rule's effect of severely limiting fuel diversity in New Jersey and Mississippi, thereby presenting significant reliability and cost concerns, especially during bouts of extreme weather, is unlawful.
16. Whether the Rule unlawfully threatens the reliability of electric supply in South Dakota because the only coal-fired power plant and the only natural gas-fired power plant in the State lack common ownership, have different regional transmission operators, and do not share a common customer base.
17. Whether the Rule unlawfully forces Texas to redesign the Electric Reliability Council of Texas ("ERCOT"), which is the only Independent System Operator in the continental United States that operates an electricity market that is wholly contained within one State and is not synchronously interconnected with the rest of the country, and which has otherwise been a vibrant and

- extremely successful competitive wholesale and retail electricity market for Texas.
18. Whether Texas is being unlawfully punished by the Rule as a first mover in the area of wind energy because, under the Rule, none of the renewable energy installed prior to January 6, 2013 (or capacity upgrades to existing renewable energy completed prior to that date) can be used by generators or the State to demonstrate compliance with the Rule.
  19. Whether the Rule unlawfully applied a 4.3% heat rate improvement to Wisconsin steam power plants.
  20. Whether the Rule unlawfully failed to consider biomass energy in developing the Wisconsin emission standard.
  21. Whether EPA unlawfully failed to consider the impact of the Rule throughout Wyoming on the greater sage grouse and other sensitive species.
  22. Whether the Rule improperly deprives North Dakota of authority to consider the remaining useful lives of regulated sources.
  23. Whether EPA abused its discretion by attempting to force North Dakota to amend its laws to enforce EPA's requirements in the Rule, and in doing so, is effectively dictating the sovereign legislative power of North Dakota.
  24. Whether EPA acted arbitrarily and capriciously, or in an otherwise irrational manner, in basing the Rule in part on an unsupported assumption as to the

heat-rate improvements that the existing coal-fired power plants in Oklahoma subject to the Rule can achieve on average.

25. Whether EPA acted arbitrarily and capriciously, or in an otherwise irrational manner, in basing the Rule in part on an unsupported assumption as to the shift in generation from coal-fired to natural-gas-fired generation achievable in Oklahoma.
26. Whether EPA acted arbitrarily and capriciously, or in an otherwise irrational manner, in basing the Rule in part on an unsupported assumption as to the amount of expanded renewable-generation capacity attainable in Oklahoma.

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**Non-State Petitioners' Record-Based Issues**

1. Whether the Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law because of EPA's failure to evaluate the achievability of its "Building Blocks" collectively, rather than the achievability of each "Building Block" standing alone.
2. Whether the Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law because of EPA's failure to demonstrate that the assumed heat rate improvements are achievable, taking into account factors that alter heat rate and the unsustainable nature of heat rate improvements.
3. Whether the Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law because of EPA's determination of a source's gas-shifting capabilities with insufficient state, region, or national-level data to support its conclusion.
4. Whether the Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law because of EPA's failure to adequately consider costs, as required under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act, when developing guidelines for "standards of performance."
5. Whether the Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law because of EPA's failure to adequately address reliability concerns.

6. Was EPA's failure to establish subcategories for different coal types by CO<sub>2</sub> emission performance characteristics when establishing the standards of performance arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not otherwise in accordance with law?
7. Whether EPA's Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful because it prohibits renewable energy resources built prior to 2013 from generating emission reduction credits that can be used to comply with the Final Rule and state or federal plans adopted thereunder.
8. Whether EPA's Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful because it is not a logical outgrowth of EPA's Proposed Rule.
9. Whether EPA's regulation of "leakage" in the Final Rule exceeded its statutory authority or is otherwise arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not in accordance with law.
10. Whether EPA's Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful because it places unnecessary and arbitrary restrictions on implementation.
11. Whether EPA properly placed into the public docket and agency record during the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) all relevant and necessary material as required by 5 U.S.C. § 553.



12. Whether EPA engaged in improper ex parte communications prior to the NPRM which formed the basis of the agency action and were undisclosed during the notice-and-comment process.
13. Whether EPA allowed personnel with conflicts of interest to draft the rule and failed to recuse decisionmakers with “unalterably closed minds” from reaching the determination to implement the Final Rule.
14. Whether EPA failed to respond to substantial issues raised in comments to the NPRM.
15. Whether in the Final Rule EPA improperly set rate-based performance standards based on an assumed level of renewable energy that has the effect of increasing system-wide carbon emissions.
16. Whether in the Final Rule EPA improperly imposed on Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and other states performance standards that are not achievable by those states utilizing the “system” identified as EPA’s definition of best system of emission reduction.
17. Whether the Final Rule’s “leakage” requirement for mass-based plans is unlawful because it attempts to regulate the operation of non-affected electric generating units (EGUs) and makes mass-based programs more stringent than rate-based plans.
18. Whether EPA’s decision in the Final Rule to exclude all existing hydro and nuclear generation and to not credit wind and solar renewable energy

generation sources or nuclear uprates constructed before 2013 for compliance under rate-based plans is arbitrary and capricious.

19. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and the Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice of and opportunity for comment on the requirement that mass-based state plans must address “leakage” to non-affected EGUs.
20. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and the Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the methodology for determining “equivalence” between the mass- and rate-based performance standards.
21. Whether EPA exceeded its authority under Section 111(d) of the Act by regulating EGUs that undergo a modification that results in an hourly increase in carbon dioxide emissions of 10 percent or less.
22. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the mass-based goals for Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and other states.
23. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the “new unit complement” to the mass-based goals for Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and other states.

24. Whether EPA's Final Rule disproportionately penalizes Texas, among other states, for proactively investing in a diverse generation portfolio, including natural gas combined cycle ("NGCC") units and renewables.
25. Whether EPA adequately considered costs in developing its standard of performance, as required by Section 111 of the Clean Air Act, in regard to the unique attributes of the Electric Reliability Council of Texas ("ERCOT") market.
26. Whether EPA adequately demonstrated that its emission performance rates are achievable at Texas units, including units owned by Luminant Generation Company LLC, Oak Grove Management Company, LLC, Big Brown Power Company, LLC, Sandow Power Company LLC, Big Brown Lignite Company LLC, Luminant Mining Company LLC, and Luminant Big Brown Mining Company LLC.
27. Whether EPA's determination of the "best system of emission reduction" is adequately demonstrated for ERCOT or is arbitrary and capricious as applied to ERCOT.
28. Whether EPA has demonstrated that the required heat rate improvements at affected sources are achievable at Texas units.
29. Whether EPA has adequately demonstrated that the shift in generation to NGCCs necessary under the Final Rule is achievable in Texas.

30. Whether EPA has adequately demonstrated that the additional amount of renewable energy required in Texas under the Final Rule can be developed and implemented in the timelines provided by EPA.
31. Whether EPA sufficiently considered reliability concerns for ERCOT, which is not interconnected with any other reliability regions.
32. Whether EPA's state goal for Texas is arbitrary and capricious and contrary to law.
33. Whether the Final Rule's "Evaluation Measurement and Verification" requirements for demand-side energy efficiency projects are arbitrary and capricious.
34. Whether EPA's failure to provide for a categorical exclusion in the Final Rule for lignite-fired power plants was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not otherwise in accordance with law.
35. Whether EPA's failure to recognize regional variability of power plant fuels was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not otherwise in accordance with law.
36. Whether in the Final Rule EPA improperly imposed on Montana performance standards that are not achievable by Montana utilizing the "system" identified as EPA's definition of best system of emission reduction.
37. Whether in the Final Rule EPA improperly imposed on Montana performance standards that are not achievable by Montana without resorting to interstate

trading of emissions, which EPA cannot require under Section 111(d) of the Act.

38. Whether EPA's Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious as applied to Petitioner NorthWestern Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy (NorthWestern) because the Final Rule requires NorthWestern to achieve additional emissions reductions in its generation asset portfolio despite the fact that NorthWestern's portfolio is already in compliance with the final 2030 emissions rate targets set in the Final Rule.
39. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the mass-based goal for the state of Montana.
40. Whether the Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because there is no record support for the achievability, by any individual unit in the category, of the emission rates that EPA established in the Rule for coal-fired units and natural gas combined cycle units.
41. Whether the Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because, in establishing the emission rate for coal-fired units, EPA double-counted incremental generation from natural gas combined cycle units.
42. Whether the Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious due to miscalculations in the States' individual target emission rates as specified by EPA.

43. Whether the Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious, or otherwise contrary to law because it does not contain adequate provisions to ensure a reliable electric supply under all reasonably foreseeable circumstances, such as during heat waves and periods of extreme cold or due to unanticipated failures or retirements of units.
44. Whether the Final Rule is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law because it does not exempt from its requirements coal- or gas-fired units that are owned by entities that do not own other units to which generation can be transferred or that cannot feasibly find replacement generation from lower-emitting or zero-emission generation sources.
45. Whether EPA's inclusion of hypothetical generation from NGCC EGUs in the Rule's goal calculations is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.
46. Whether EPA's failure to apply the sales exclusion in the Rule's goal calculations, which resulted in non-affected EGUs being included in the goal calculations, is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.
47. Whether EPA's inclusion of generation capacity from duct burners of NGCC EGUs in the Rule's calculations of Building Block 2 is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.

48. Whether EPA's inclusion of EGUs that were under construction, out of service, retired, and/or announced for retirement in 2012 in the Rule's goal calculations is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.
49. Whether EPA's use of unrealistic emission rates for coal-fired and NGCC EGUs in the Rule's goal calculations is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.
50. Whether the Rule violates section 111 of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7411, and is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful because EPA based its emission guidelines on: (a) heat rate improvements at coal-fired EGUs under Building Block 1 that are not achievable, and (b) levels of increased utilization of NGCC units under Building Block 2 that are not achievable.
51. Whether EPA's failure to account for conflicts between Building Block 1 of the best system of emission reduction and the CAA's New Source Review program is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise unlawful.
52. Whether in the Final Rule EPA improperly imposed on Kansas performance standards that are not achievable by Kansas utilizing the "system" identified as EPA's definition of best system of emission reduction.

53. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the mass-based goal for the state of Kansas.
54. Whether EPA's decision in the Final Rule not to credit carbon sequestration for compliance under rate- or mass-based plans is arbitrary and capricious.
55. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the mass-based goal for the state of Oklahoma.
56. Whether EPA contravened the Clean Air Act and Administrative Procedure Act by failing to provide adequate notice and opportunity to comment on the "new unit complement" to the mass-based goals for Oklahoma.
57. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA based its cost-benefit analysis on alleged global benefits that do not accrue to the United States or its citizens, even though all of the costs of the rule will be borne by domestic entities.
58. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA's reliance on foreign benefits violates the Clean Air Act's purpose, which is "to protect and enhance the quality of *the Nation's* air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of *its* population." 42 U.S.C. § 7401(b) (emphasis added).



59. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA's reliance on foreign benefits violates guidance of the Office of Management and Budget, which requires a regulatory impact analysis to "focus on benefits and costs that accrue to citizens and residents of the United States." Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-4, at 15.
60. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA based its cost-benefit analysis on the alleged health benefits of incidental reductions of fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and ozone, even though section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act expressly excludes those criteria pollutants from the statute's delegation of rulemaking authority.
61. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA's calculation of these "co-benefits" is based on double-counting of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone reductions mandated by other EPA rules, and over-counting of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone in areas that are already in attainment with EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standards for those pollutants.
62. Whether the rule effects an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the executive branch in violation of the constitutional separation of powers, under *Whitman v. American Trucking Associations*, 531 U.S. 457, 475-76 (2001), and *Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO v. American Petroleum Institute*, 448 U.S. 607, 644-45 (1980), in that the alleged health benefits on which the rule is based result from pollution reduction below the level "necessary to protect public

- health” from a “significant risk of harm,” as set forth in EPA’s own National Ambient Air Quality Standards.
63. Whether the rule is arbitrary and capricious because EPA’s cost-benefit analysis fails to account for “carbon leakage,” which is the tendency of energy intensive industries to move to countries where carbon emissions are regulated less stringently and the price of energy is lower.
  64. Whether the rule is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law because it has a disparate impact on electric cooperatives, making it impossible to provide reliable, low cost electricity to rural America (including the poorest parts of the country), contrary to federal and state law.
  65. Whether EPA’s Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious or otherwise unlawful under Section 307(d) of the Clean Air Act and the Administrative Procedure Act because EPA revised the applicability language for affected electric generating units in the Final Rule without providing the required notice and opportunity to comment and because the applicability language is not a logical outgrowth of EPA’s Proposed Rule.
  66. Whether the Final Rule results in an unconstitutional taking of property in violation of the Fifth Amendment.
  67. Whether EPA’s rule is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law because the rule limits the emission rate credit eligibility of waste to energy

facilities to electricity produced from the biogenic portion of the facility's waste throughput while excluding the anthropogenic portion.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 27th day of January 2016, the foregoing document was served electronically through the Court's CM/ECF system on all registered counsel.

/s/ Allison D. Wood  
Allison D. Wood