

From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Subject: an industry letter worth reading
Date: 09/21/2010 05:30 AM
Attachments: [100915_Ltr_to_Jackson_GHG_NSPS\[1\].pdf](#)

Hi Administrator,
The attached letter (industry's counter to the enviros' letter demanding a utility NSPS schedule by Sept 15) is worth reading, if you have 10 free minutes at some point in the next couple of days.

-David

▼ [Patricia Embrey](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: Patricia Embrey
Sent: 09/16/2010 11:41 AM EDT
To: David McIntosh
Subject: The industry letter I mentioned thos morning



From: [David McIntosh](mailto:David.McIntosh@epa.gov)
To: windsor.richard@epa.gov
Cc: mccarthy.gina@epa.gov; depass.michelle@epa.gov; oster.seth@epa.gov; heinzerling.lisa@epa.gov; thompson.diane@epa.gov
Subject: CLIMATE: Centrist Senate Dems send Copenhagen wish list to White House (12/03/2009)
Date: 12/03/2009 01:29 PM
Attachments: [document_gw_02.pdf](#)

(a PDF of the letter is attached)

Darren Samuelsohn, E&E senior reporter

Nine centrist Senate Democrats sent principles to President Obama today on what they would like him to deliver to U.N. global warming negotiations that start next week in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania took the lead on the detailed [letter](#) to the White House that outlines 10 core issues that the senators think "should be embodied in new international agreements and in domestic legislation."

"We stand ready to work with you to develop timely, affordable and effective climate solutions that are consistent with these principles, including a carefully-designed mandatory program that would reduce U.S. emissions, spur international action and help ensure a level playing field for U.S. companies and workers," the group of rural and Rust Belt senators wrote.

Other Democrats joining in the letter include Carl Levin and Debbie Stabenow of Michigan, Tim Johnson of South Dakota, Sherrod Brown of Ohio, Claire McCaskill of Missouri, Amy Klobuchar of Minnesota, Kay Hagan of North Carolina, and Mark Begich of North Carolina. Five of the signatures come from senators whom E&E [counts](#) as "fence sitters" in the climate debate: Specter, Levin, Stabenow, McCaskill and Begich.

Their five-page letter starts with a call for the next international climate treaty to be premised on limiting global average temperature increases to no more than 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit above preindustrial levels -- roughly the threshold that scientists say would stave off the worst effects of global warming. They said that would mean a global emissions cut of 50 percent by 2050, with industrialized countries making midcentury cuts of 80 percent or more and "developing nations taking increasingly ambitious actions to limit and then reduce their emissions in the same time frame."

Sticking to U.N. parlance that will be closely debated over the next two weeks by some 190 nations in Copenhagen, the senators suggest that "all major economies should adopt ambitious, quantifiable, measurable, reportable and verifiable national actions."

"These programs," the senators add, "are essential for the United States and other nations to

evaluate the adequacy, comparability and equity of proposed policies and actions."

Specter and company also key in on a critical component of the U.N. talks by stating that "verification is essential" for the next international agreement to replace the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. They said Obama and others should agree on enforcement mechanisms for countries that do not meet their commitments, so long as the penalties are "consistent with national sovereignty."

World leaders have already punted until next year any chance of reaching agreement on a final, legally binding treaty, which pushes back even further the prospect of ratification. Given that time lag, the senators say any U.S. climate legislation should include border adjustment fees consistent with World Trade Organization requirements for imports from countries that do not adopt sufficient emission controls.

"Any border adjustment policies should take effect by a date certain if appropriate international agreements have not entered into force," they wrote.

Obama earlier this summer put himself on a collision course with some of the same Democratic senators when he warned against "sending any protectionist signals out there" through a new domestic global warming law. White House officials have since stayed away from making any public statements on the issue.

White House mostly agrees

In an e-mail today, White House spokesman Ben LaBolt ticked through U.S. efforts on climate change, including the House-passed legislation to cap domestic emissions, new fuel economy standards and funding in the economic stimulus law aimed at expanding energy efficiency.

Without going into specifics, LaBolt said of the Senate Democrats' letter, "The president agrees with many of the senators' recommendations and has worked with other world leaders to advance a Copenhagen accord that reflects them."

Obama and Danish Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen, the host of the U.N. talks, are working "in support of a comprehensive accord in which all countries take meaningful steps, that has immediate operational effect and rallies a global response to the global threat of climate change," LaBolt said.

Several close observers to the U.N. and domestic climate debate also welcomed the Senate Democrats' principles.

"It represents the first time in a decade that a significant portion of the Senate has articulated substantive principles to guide U.S. climate diplomacy and has clarified how international climate cooperation would affect U.S. domestic legislation," said Nigel Purvis, a former State Department climate negotiator who helped the senators on details of their letter.

"While these principles are not perfect, they are reasonable, and that's very encouraging," Purvis added. "U.S. negotiators should strive to make sure that any outcome in Copenhagen is consistent with these principles, and I believe they will, because the Obama administration understands that the Senate's reactions to Copenhagen is extremely important to domestic climate legislation and eventual U.S. participation in a new climate agreement."

"The letter is positive engagement by a group of important senators on some of the most critical issues in the debate," said Tony Kreindler, a spokesman at the Environmental Defense Fund. "It's a very constructive step."

Lou Dobbs and Sen. Inhofe

Headed into Copenhagen, Obama has come under attack in recent days by critics complaining about his decision to attend the negotiations pledging to curb U.S. emissions 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020.

Last week, for example, Sen. Jim Webb (D-Va.) wrote to the White House: "I would like to express my concern regarding reports that the administration may believe it has the unilateral power to commit the government of the United States to certain standards that may be agreed upon at the upcoming United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties 15 in Copenhagen, Denmark. The phrase 'politically binding' has been used."

Webb added, "As you well know from your time in the Senate, only specific legislation agreed upon in the Congress, or a treaty ratified by the Senate, could actually create such a commitment on behalf of our country."

Pouring fuel on the fire, conservative radio host Lou Dobbs discussed the Copenhagen talks on his program Tuesday with Senate Environment and Public Works Committee ranking member James Inhofe (R-Okla.).

Inhofe explained his reasons for going to Copenhagen to counter any comments from the president and his top allies. "I wanted to make sure that countries were fully informed that we are not going to be passing legislation that will accomplish what President Obama, I believe, is going to tell," Inhofe said.

"Senator," Dobbs responded, "this begs the question, if I may put it forward right now: Who the hell does this president think he is?"

"I don't know, because you can't do that," Inhofe replied. "And I think it's certainly disingenuous to mislead countries into thinking that a president. ... You know, this is not a kingdom. He's not able to do that."



document_gw_02.pdf

From: [Bob Perciasepe](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Adora Andy](#)
Subject: Dispersant Science Report
Date: 07/10/2010 05:44 AM
Attachments: [dwh_dispersants_use_meeting_report.pdf](#)

Trying to get this through.
Bob Perciasepe
Office of the Administrator
(o)202 564 4711
(c) (b) (6) Personal Privacy
▼ [Lek Kadeli](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: Lek Kadeli
Sent: 06/18/2010 11:28 AM EDT
To: Bob Perciasepe
Cc: Paul Anastas
Subject: Report



dwh_dispersants_use_meeting_report.pdf

Lek Kadeli
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management
Office of Research and Development
Environmental Protection Agency
Ronald Reagan Bldg
1300 Penn Ave
Washington, D.C. 20460
8101R
Tel: 202 564-6620
Fax: 202 565-2907
Email: kadeli.lek@epa.gov

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Karen Mills](#)
Subject: From Lisa Jackson: NPC Speech
Date: 03/10/2010 06:30 AM
Attachments: [20100308 Press Club \(as prepared FINAL\).doc](#)

▼ [Michael Moats](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: Michael Moats
Sent: 03/08/2010 10:56 AM EST
To: Richard Windsor
Cc: Seth Oster; Allyn Brooks-LaSure
Subject: Speech to send to Friedman etc.
Attached.



20100308 Press Club (as prepared FINAL).doc

Michael Moats
Chief Speechwriter
US EPA | Office of the Administrator
Office: 202-564-1687
Mobile: 202-527-4436

From: [Gina McCarthy](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Cc: [Bob Perciasepe](#)
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay
Date: 11/02/2010 01:16 PM
Attachments: [10-1092 - 2010 11 01- Auto Intervenors' Opposition to Stay Motion - Nov 1 - 2010 FINAL.pdf](#)

This is Cool.

From: Margo Oge
Sent: 11/02/2010 01:09 PM EDT
To: Gina McCarthy; "Chet France" <france.chet@epa.gov>; "John Hannon" <hannon.john@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay

From: Vickie Patton [vpatton@edf.org]
Sent: 11/02/2010 12:17 PM AST
To: Vickie Patton <vpatton@edf.org>
Subject: Automakers Opposition to Stay

The attached opposition was filed by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and Association of International Automobile Manufacturers.

See page 18:

Accordingly, movants' statement that "no one will be harmed by the stay," *see* CRR Br. 79, 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.

* * *

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal.

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [David McIntosh](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#); [Scott Fulton](#)
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay
Date: 11/02/2010 01:28 PM
Attachments: [10-1092 - 2010 11 01- Auto Intervenors' Opposition to Stay Motion - Nov 1 - 2010 FINAL.pdf](#)

----- Forwarded by Richard Windsor/DC/USEPA/US on 11/02/2010 01:27 PM -----

From: Gina McCarthy/DC/USEPA/US
To: Richard Windsor/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Bob Perciasepe" <perciasepe.bob@epa.gov>
Date: 11/02/2010 01:16 PM
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay

This is Cool.

From: Margo Oge
Sent: 11/02/2010 01:09 PM EDT
To: Gina McCarthy; "Chet France" <france.chet@epa.gov>; "John Hannon" <hannon.john@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay

From: Vickie Patton [vpatton@edf.org]
Sent: 11/02/2010 12:17 PM AST
To: Vickie Patton <vpatton@edf.org>
Subject: Automakers Opposition to Stay

The attached opposition was filed by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and

Association of International Automobile Manufacturers.

See page 18:

Accordingly, movants' statement that "no one will be harmed by the stay," *see* CRR Br. 79, 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.

* * *

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information

by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal.



From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Lisa At Home](#)
Subject: Fw: Blog Round-up - April 9, 2010
Date: 04/09/2010 11:48 AM
Attachments: [Blog Round-up - April 9, 2010.doc](#)

▼ [OPA Multimedia E-Clips](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: OPA Multimedia E-Clips
Sent: 04/09/2010 11:36 AM EDT
To: Blog Round-up; Blog Round-up 1; Blog Round-up 2; Blog Round-up 3;
Blog Round-up R6
Subject: Blog Round-up - April 9, 2010



Blog Round-up - April 9, 2010.doc

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Seth Oster](#)
Subject: Fw: E-Clips - Monday, July 12, 2010 Edition
Date: 07/12/2010 09:04 AM
Attachments: [E-Clips - Monday, July 12, 2010.doc](#)

See the first article.

▼ [OPA Multimedia E-Clips](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: OPA Multimedia E-Clips
Sent: 07/12/2010 07:52 AM EDT
Subject: E-Clips - Monday, July 12, 2010 Edition

Good Morning: Here is your daily national news E-Clips document. This is a service provided by HQs Office of Public Affairs. Please note that the table of contents is hyperlinked. This means you may with one click or a combination of holding down the control key and a click on any article listed in the table of content to be taken to that article.

E-Clips contain copyrighted materials and are made available to designated recipients. Neither the E-Clips nor any individual article within may be further distributed.



E-Clips - Monday, July 12, 2010.doc

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Lisa At Home](#)
Subject: Fw: FYI Presidential Proclamation -- Earth Day
Date: 04/21/2010 07:41 PM
Attachments: [2010earthday.prc.rel.pdf](#)

▼ [Diane Thompson](#)

----- Original Message -----
From: Diane Thompson
Sent: 04/21/2010 07:40 PM EDT
To: Richard Windsor; "Bob Perciasepe" <perciasepe.bob@epa.gov>
Cc: "Aaron Dickerson" <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>; "Robert Goulding" <goulding.robert@epa.gov>; "Dan Kanninen" <kanninen.daniel@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: FYI Presidential Proclamation -- Earth Day

▼ [Michael Moats](#)

----- Original Message -----
From: Michael Moats
Sent: 04/21/2010 07:38 PM EDT
To: moats.michael@epa.gov
Subject: FYI Presidential Proclamation -- Earth Day

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
April 21, 2010

Attached is a proclamation signed by the President today regarding Earth Day.



2010earthday.prc.rel.pdf

From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); thompson.diane@epa.gov; [Arvin Ganesan](#)
Subject: Fw: Notification Memo - Evaluation of the Development of EPA's Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases (Assignment Number 2010-OPE-0007).
Date: 04/08/2010 03:16 PM
Attachments: [GHG Endangerment Finding Assignment Notification Memo--04-08-10.doc](#)
[4-7 epa ig letter.pdf](#)

Just FYI

▼ [Dina Kruger](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: Dina Kruger
Sent: 04/08/2010 03:13 PM EDT
To: David McIntosh; Joseph Goffman; Carol Holmes; John Hannon; Diann Frantz; Patricia Haman
Subject: Fw: Notification Memo - Evaluation of the Development of EPA's Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases (Assignment Number 2010-OPE-0007).
FYI

Dina Kruger
Director, Climate Change Division
USEPA

202-343-9039 (phone)
202-343-2290 (fax)

----- Forwarded by Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US on 04/08/2010 03:10 PM -----

From: Rick Beusse/RTP/USEPA/US
To: Gina McCarthy/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Wade Najjum/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Mclean/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jackie Krieger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, David LaRoche/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bill Roderick/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Bialek/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Melissa Heist/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Eileen McMahon/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Patricia Hill/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Nesbitt/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Elizabeth Grossman/OIG/USEPA/US, Jim Hatfield/RTP/USEPA/US@EPA, Bao Chuong/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Andrew Lavenburg/RTP/USEPA/US, John Manibusan/OIG/USEPA/US@EPA, Rick Beusse/RTP/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/08/2010 01:07 PM
Subject: Notification Memo - Evaluation of the Development of EPA's Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases (Assignment Number 2010-OPE-0007).

Attached is a memorandum to inform you that the EPA Office of Inspector General plans to begin an evaluation of the *Development of EPA's Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases* (Assignment Number 2010-OPE-0007). We are initiating this assignment based on a request from Senator James M. Inhofe, Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works (attached). Our objective is to determine whether EPA followed key federal and Agency regulations and policies in developing and reviewing the technical data used to support and make its

endangerment finding.

We will contact you or your staff in the near future to arrange a mutually agreeable time for an entrance conference to discuss the assignment plans. If you or your staff have any questions, please contact Rick Beusse at (919)541-5457, or Jim Hatfield, Project Manager, at (919)541-1030.

Best regards,

J. Rick Beusse
for

Wade T. Najjum
Assistant Inspector General for Program Evaluation
EPA Office of Inspector General

attachments - 2



GHG Endangerment Finding Assignment Notification Memo--04-08-10.doc



4-7 epa ig letter.pdf

From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Subject: Fw: OFFICIAL RELEASE: Statement of Administration Policy on S.J. Res. 26 - Disapproval of EPA Endangerment Rule and Cause and Contribute Findings
Date: 06/08/2010 01:15 PM
Attachments: [SAP on S.J. Res. 26.pdf](#)

FYI

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503**

June 8, 2010

(Senate)

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
S.J. Res. 26 – Disapproval of EPA Endangerment Rule and Cause and Contribute Findings

(Sen. Murkowski, R-Alaska, and 40 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes Senate passage of S.J. Res. 26, which would undermine the Clean Air Act and hinder EPA's ability to comply with a Supreme Court ruling on greenhouse gasses (GHGs). The Administration believes that comprehensive energy and climate legislation is the most effective way to transition to a clean energy economy that will create jobs, protect the environment, and increase national security. S.J. Res. 26 would do just the opposite; it would increase the Nation's dependence on oil and other fossil fuels and block efforts to cut pollution that threatens our health and well-being.

Specifically, passage of S.J. Res. 26 would block implementation of an historic, multi-agency Federal program set in motion by the Administration to promote fuel economy standards that will reduce oil consumption, save American consumers more than \$3,000 in fuel costs over the lifetime of a model year 2016 vehicle, and limit pollution from tailpipe emissions. S.J. Res. 26 also would undermine the Administration's efforts to reduce the negative impacts of pollution and the risks associated with environmental catastrophes, like the ongoing BP oil spill. As seen in the Gulf of Mexico, environmental disasters harm families, destroy jobs, and pollute the Nation's air, land and water. Further, S.J. Res. 26 is contrary to the widely-accepted scientific consensus that GHGs are at increasingly dangerous concentrations and are contributing to the threat of climate change. S.J. Res. 26 would strip EPA of its authority to protect the public from GHG pollution, and thus prevent it from following its statutory obligations as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Finally, S.J. Res. 26 would undo EPA's carefully constructed approach to reducing pollution generated by the largest oil companies, oil refineries, and other large-scale polluters. EPA's reasoned approach will provide industry certainty, which is essential to jumpstarting private - sector investments and innovation in clean, renewable energy. S.J. Res. 26 would block the United States from taking action to control environmentally damaging GHGs while other

nations take the lead in transitioning to clean energy economies that create the jobs of the future.

If the President is presented with this Resolution of Disapproval, which would seriously disrupt EPA's ability to address the threat of GHG pollution, as well as the multi-agency Federal GHG and fuel economy program, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution.

* * * * *



SAP on S.J. Res. 26.pdf

From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Seth Oster](#)
Subject: Fw: UAW Letter Opposing Disapproval Resolutions
Date: 03/15/2010 02:28 PM
Attachments: [Disapproval Resolution 1.doc](#)

From: Alan Reuther [mailto:AREuther@uaw.net]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 2:08 PM
To: Miller, Chris (Reid); Thompson, Darrel (Reid)
Cc: Poirier, Bettina (EPW)
Subject: UAW Letter Opposing Disapproval Resolutions

Attached is the letter the UAW just sent to the Hill opposing any disapproval resolutions or riders seeking to overturn the EPA's endangerment finding on

greenhouse gas emissions.



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Subject: Fw: UAW Letter opposing Murkowski Disapproval resolution
Date: 06/07/2010 11:44 AM
Attachments: [Murkowski Resolution.pdf](#)

FYI

----- Forwarded by David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US on 06/07/2010 11:44 AM -----

From: "Alan Reuther" <AReuther@uaw.net>
To: David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 06/07/2010 11:40 AM
Subject: UAW Letter opposing Murkowski Disapproval resolution

Here is the letter we are sending to the Senate today.



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#)
Subject: here is the Chamber's Letter
Date: 07/14/2010 05:18 PM
Attachments: [Chamber Letter.pdf](#)

The language putting EPA in the cross-hairs reads: "The Environmental Protection Agency is moving forward with 29 major economic rules and 173 major policy rules, an unprecedented level of regulatory action."



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Scott Fulton](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#); [Lawrence Elworth](#); [Arvin Ganesan](#); [Janet Woodka](#)
Subject: Highlights from EPA's reply to Mr Barton
Date: 11/08/2010 05:14 PM
Attachments: [101410_Letter_EPA_Jackson_Regs.pdf](#)
[101410_CAA_Regs_Chart.pdf](#)
[Adm Jackson reply to Cong Barton and Burgess.pdf](#)

Hi Administrator and Team:

Mr Barton and Mr Burgess sent Administrator Jackson (and reporters) the attached letter on October 14. At around noon today, Administrator Jackson sent Mr Barton and Mr Burgess the attached reply. Here are some excerpts from the reply:

* The pace of EPA's Clean Air Act regulatory work under this administration is actually not faster than the pace under either of the two previous administrations. In fact, EPA has finalized or proposed fewer Clean Air Act rules (87) over the past 21 months than in the first two years of either President George W. Bush's administration (146) or President Clinton's administration (115).

* The chart attached to [the October 14] letter does not present the projected economic benefits of any of the listed rulemakings. ... Had the chart included the benefits projections, readers of it would have been able to see that the projected benefits of EPA's pollution reduction rules under the Clean Air Act exceed the projected costs by 13 to 1.

* According to the current, public draft of an EPA report entitled "The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act: 1990 to 2020," the benefits of Clean Air Act rules are expected to reach nearly \$2 trillion in 2020 – exceeding costs by more than 30 to 1.

* Data from the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers indicates that the number of boilermakers in the United States increased by 6,700 – or 35 percent – from 1999 to 2001 as a result of EPA rulemakings implementing the Clean Air Act.

* The Institute of Clean Air Companies estimates that preparations to comply with just one of those rules have occupied approximately 200,000 person-years of labor over the past seven years.

* The Department of Commerce estimates that, in 2007, environmental firms and small businesses in the United States generated \$282 billion in revenues and \$40 billion in exports, while supporting 1.6 million American jobs. Air pollution control equipment alone generated revenues of \$18.3 billion in 2007, including exports of more than \$3 billion.

qf9SAAoACAgAAEYAMTAxNDEwX0xldHRlcl9FUEFFSmFja3NvbI9SZWdzLnBkZgAxMDE0MTBfTGVO
dGVyX0VQOV9KYWNrc29uX1JIZ3MucGRmAA==


mQcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAA==
fQAcAAAAAQoACIA3AMAAAEEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA==
fADmAwAA3APcA0dJRjg5YSgAlgDmaAAD////w8PCwsLDIyMhISEjo6OjY2Nj46Oj48PB4AACIlilio
AACwAADg4OD4SEjAAADIAAC4uLjQCAg4QEBGaGBwAACgoKDAwMDQ0NBoAACQmJCYmJjQAADgICD4
WFj4aGj4qKh4gHigAADQEDYEBDgGBjgMDD4ODj4QED4eHj42NhgYGCosKi4AADQEBDgODjoKCjo
MDDoODjoaGjwODjw4OD4ilj4mJ4uLhQWFhgAABoaGiAgICIAACQKJCYAACwCAi4EBDAEBDQICDY
CAjYKCjYMDDgYGDwQEDwaGjweHj4GBj4KCj4yMhwHCQAACoqKjAGBjAyMjIjGBjIICDQKcJqIDY
cHDgSEjgWFjoICDoSEjocHdoiJDwMDDwkJDwoKDwsLDwyMjw2Njw6Oj4CAj4cHD4wMD44OAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACGAlgBACP8AAQgcSLCgwYMIES6QwNDFkQMuHB7AckDCgSwQIDzY2AODAB8K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dv9CACyAAAEAAAKBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAgMTAxNDEwX0xldHRlcl9FUEFFSmFja3NvbI9S
ZWdzLnBkZiAg qgl=

qf9AAAoACAgAADQAMTAxNDEwX0N0BQV9SZWdzX0NoYXJlbnBkZgAxMDE0MTBfQ0FBX1JIZ3NfQ2hh
cnQucGRmAA== mQcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAA==
fQAcAAAAAQoACIA3AMAAAEEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA==
fADmAwAA3APcA0dJRjg5YSgAlgDmaAAD////w8PCwsLDIyMhISEjo6OjY2Nj46Oj48PB4AACIlilio
AACwAADg4OD4SEjAAADIAAC4uLjQCAg4QEBGaGBwAACgoKDAwMDQ0NBoAACQmJCYmJjQAADgICD4
WFj4aGj4qKh4gHigAADQEDYEBDgGBjgMDD4ODj4QED4eHj42NhgYGCosKi4AADQEBDgODjoKCjo
MDDoODjoaGjwODjw4OD4ilj4mJ4uLhQWFhgAABoaGiAgICIAACQKJCYAACwCAi4EBDAEBDQICDY
CAjYKCjYMDDgYGDwQEDwaGjweHj4GBj4KCj4yMhwHCQAACoqKjAGBjAyMjIjGBjIICDQKcJqIDY
cHDgSEjgWFjoICDoSEjocHdoiJDwMDDwkJDwoKDwsLDwyMjw2Njw6Oj4CAj4cHD4wMD44OAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACGAlgBACP8AAQgcSLCgwYMIES6QwNDFkQMuHB7AckDCgSwQIDzY2AODAB8K
NIwwECGhSQEAAqhcGeCGA5YwA6A0eXAmABsgHACYMACAhp4AVgg8QAaATZpIk5p8gcKBUXQoaNDw
AgOlg4ISJAgIoEDhAUWfBQAitSA2bNnNwxYy3btCctrAxSYS7fAUaV3BTpQAaBJGRwxjSolmJdF
AQsWFGBOEEGDggYaWAgELNAmS7oGBhi4QHkIjBiglSBIgkD0FgQIEMzY2hXCjwiPazTgTLPHgtsL

GOjerRv3bRHAK8w1gGFAhAgC8iJFGTPAieYsldPMq/KDBxDQJ1POy8SDAxB8Aaj/sJ7iRgDtg2c6
bQKARQ4nBBROsDAh/gQKQqWbvLCDgP//AAb43w60UdbWgW2VRJkJJrwwg4MvMGhEEUVUMQQVU0Qh
RBBBAAGEWmQhZQONSCCBghklIHAGaQh80UGKYpDQmghQ8FBAAyEmJEQJHfTIRYpgzIDaATMccEAY
HHgFwRMDbGBASrPR9MNGG41wwAMQWInGFQ8cMEILYOqWQAMebaAAD4rpl8CabLZZwZtvZiCnnDro
UFcDeBggX0LMxXRCdTHNpdKeCPUJkwc2QDcoZZUNBBMITCggE6PoDaSCBzUsAWhghNZkEA4pAHAA
CB+csIQDKaTwwXmdGnTUATbcQWDSGF1UmtRMH+BwwgEYTOAYARZQoMF9Uqxgga3LGRRCCP6FQIEC
OUzALAUItVqQta5S2kBy3Hbr7bc5UiruQAEBADs=
dv85ABOAAAEAAkBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAgMTAxNDEwX0NBQV9SZWdzX0NoYXJ0LnBkZiAg
qgl=



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: windsor.richard@epa.gov; [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Scott Fulton](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#)
Subject: list/schedule of upcoming EPA rules
Date: 11/07/2010 02:55 PM
Attachments: [Administrative Rules.xls](#)

I received the attached second-hand -- and unsolicited. Apparently, it is the Sierra Club's list and schedule of upcoming EPA rules. I'm forwarding it just FYI.  [- Administrative Rules.xls](#)

From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Arvin Ganesan](#); [Janet Woodka](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#)
Subject: New Oil Spill Commission Dispersant Report
Date: 10/06/2010 12:23 PM
Attachments: [Working Paper.Amount and Fate.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Arctic.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Dispersants.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Unified Command.pdf](#)

Apparently the Oil Spill Commission just released 4 reports. One of them relates to the use of dispersants. All 4 documents are attached here.



From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Gina McCarthy](#)
Cc: [Bob Perciasepe](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay
Date: 11/02/2010 01:28 PM
Attachments: [10-1092 - 2010 11 01- Auto Intervenors' Opposition to Stay Motion - Nov 1 - 2010 FINAL.pdf](#)

Indeed! Tx.

▼ [Gina McCarthy---11/02/2010 01:16:40 PM---This is Cool.](#) ----- Original Message

From: Gina McCarthy/DC/USEPA/US
To: Richard Windsor/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Bob Perciasepe" <perciasepe.bob@epa.gov>
Date: 11/02/2010 01:16 PM
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay

This is Cool.

From: Margo Oge
Sent: 11/02/2010 01:09 PM EDT
To: Gina McCarthy; "Chet France" <france.chet@epa.gov>; "John Hannon" <hannon.john@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: Automakers Opposition to Stay

From: Vickie Patton [vpatton@edf.org]
Sent: 11/02/2010 12:17 PM AST
To: Vickie Patton <vpatton@edf.org>
Subject: Automakers Opposition to Stay

The attached opposition was filed by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and Association of International Automobile Manufacturers.

See page 18:

Accordingly, movants' statement that "no one will be harmed by the stay," *see* CRR Br. 79, 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.

* * *

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be

illegal. 

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [Arvin Ganesan](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Safe Chemicals Act materials
Date: 04/15/2010 11:44 AM
Attachments: [Safe Chemicals Act of 2010.pdf](#)
[Summary.docx](#)
[Section by Section.docx](#)

yes asap please.

congrats on a good day!

▼ Arvin Ganesan---04/15/2010 11:42:31 AM---Here's the bill and the summary. I'm going through it now. Should I get a meeting together with Stev

From: Arvin Ganesan/DC/USEPA/US
To: Richard Windsor/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/15/2010 11:42 AM
Subject: Fw: Safe Chemicals Act materials

Here's the bill and the summary. I'm going through it now. Should I get a meeting together with Steve?

ARVIN R. GANESAN
Deputy Associate Administrator
Congressional Affairs
Office of the Administrator
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Ganesan.Arvin@epa.gov
(p) 202.564.5200
(f) 202.501.1519

----- Forwarded by Arvin Ganesan/DC/USEPA/US on 04/15/2010 11:41 AM -----

From: "Dunham, Ben (Lautenberg)" <Ben_Dunham@lautenberg.senate.gov>
To: Arvin Ganesan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/15/2010 09:26 AM
Subject: Fw: Safe Chemicals Act materials

From: Dunham, Ben (Lautenberg)
To: Gray, Caley (Lautenberg); Ribas, Gail (Lautenberg)
Sent: Wed Apr 14 20:34:25 2010
Subject: Safe Chemicals Act materials

Here is the PDF of the bill, the summary, and the section-by-section.

Ben Dunham
Legislative Assistant and Counsel
US Senator Frank R. Lautenberg
202.224.3224



Safe Chemicals Act of 2010.pdf



Summary.docx



Section by Section.docx

From: [Richard Windsor](#)
To: [David McIntosh](#)
Cc: [Arvin Ganesan](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Janet Woodka](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#); [Seth Oster](#)
Subject: Re: New Oil Spill Commission Dispersant Report
Date: 10/06/2010 01:44 PM
Attachments: [Working Paper.Amount and Fate.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Arctic.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Dispersants.pdf](#)
[Working Paper.Unified Command.pdf](#)

Quick read of dispersant report is ok..

▼ [David McIntosh---10/06/2010 12:23:05 PM---Apparently the Oil Spill Commission just released 4 reports. One of them relates to the use of disp](#)

From: David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US
To: Richard Windsor/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Thompson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Perciasepe/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Seth Oster/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Arvin Ganesan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Woodka/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Heinzerling/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 10/06/2010 12:23 PM
Subject: New Oil Spill Commission Dispersant Report

Apparently the Oil Spill Commission just released 4 reports. One of them relates to the use of dispersants. All 4 documents are attached here.



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Cc: [Gina McCarthy](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Arvin Ganesan](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#)
Subject: Senators' letter to you about the boiler MACT rulemaking
Date: 03/26/2010 03:54 PM
Attachments: [Letter to Administrator Lisa Jackson, March 26, 20100001.pdf](#)

Administrator: Attached is a letter about the boiler MACT rulemaking that Senators Voinovich, Brown, Cornyn, Lugar, Alexander, Bayh, Bond, Warner, and Webb have just send to you, cc'ing Gina, Bob, Bob, Cass Sunstein, and Larry Summers.

-David

----- Forwarded by David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US on 03/26/2010 03:50 PM -----

From: "Johnston, Todd (Voinovich)" <Todd_Johnston@voinovich.senate.gov>
To: David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 03/26/2010 03:48 PM
Subject: Letter to Administrator Jackson

David – This letter has several CCs at EPA, including: Gina McCarthy, Robert Perciasepe and Robert Sussman.

Thanks,

Todd



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#); [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#); [Scott Fulton](#); [Arvin Ganesan](#)
Subject: this is very helpful
Date: 11/04/2010 08:27 AM
Attachments: [ICAC_Carper_Response_110310.pdf](#)

Attached is a report that the Institute of Clean Air Companies has just completed in response to questions posed by Senator Carper. It concludes that the air pollution control industry and the labor pool are perfectly capable of supplying and installing the pollution controls that are likely to be necessitated by EPA's unfolding Clean Air Act rules.



From: [David McIntosh](#)
To: [Richard Windsor](#)
Cc: [Diane Thompson](#); [Bob Perciasepe](#); [Bob Sussman](#); [Lisa Heinzerling](#); [Seth Oster](#); [Arvin Ganesan](#); [Lawrence Elworth](#); [Scott Fulton](#)
Subject: we have received the Senate boiler MACT letter
Date: 09/27/2010 04:56 PM
Attachments: [BMACT Letter with signatures.pdf](#)

It's attached. In the end only 41 signatures, which is at least 20 fewer than I was expecting. In the end, Senator Landrieu is the lead D on it. Senator Collins is the lead R.

Liz 