



Stakeholders Oppose the Trump Administration’s Proposal to Roll Back Clean Car Standards (released August 2, 2018)

AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS & DEALERS..... 1

OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS ..... 2

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS..... 4

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEADERS ..... 7

FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ..... 10

HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS..... 15

CONSUMER ADVOCATES ..... 16

LABOR..... 17

NATIONAL SECURITY EXPERTS ..... 18

ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ..... 18

ACADEMICS AND EXPERTS ..... 19

    Legal ..... 19

    Technical..... 21

    Economics..... 23

EDITORIAL BOARDS ..... 24

AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS & DEALERS

**Alliance of Auto Manufacturers and Global Automakers**

[Los Angeles Times, 8/2/18](#)

- In letters to [California Governor Jerry] Brown and Trump, the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and the Assn. of Global Automakers, the industry’s two lobbying groups, repeated their desire for changes in the Obama-era rules but notably did not endorse the administration’s proposal to freeze the fuel standards in 2020. The groups urged both sides to negotiate. “In our eyes, a negotiated settlement is preferable to a bifurcated system and years of litigation,” they wrote in the letter to Trump.

[Bloomberg, 8/2/18](#)

- “With today’s release of the administration’s proposals, it’s time for substantive negotiations to begin,” the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and the Association of Global Automakers said in a statement. “We urge California and the federal government to find a common sense solution that sets continued increases in vehicle efficiency standards while also meeting the needs of America’s drivers.”

**Adam Lee, Owner of Lee Auto Malls dealerships**

[Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- “The last five years, we've sold more cars than have ever been sold in the history of the auto industry. It's not just because, but it coincides with these new standards. They're better cars, they're more fuel efficient. It clearly has not dampened sales.”
- “We need those manufacturers to keep doing research and building better vehicles like they have been doing. And if they stop because the standards are reversed, it would be bad for us as a business, and for this country.”

OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS

**John Boesel, President of CALSTART**, an organization with 190 member companies representing a broad range of clean transportation technologies and fleets

[Press Release, 8/2/18](#)

- “This is a huge setback for the industry, especially suppliers that create two thirds of all US auto related jobs. Automotive suppliers are making billion dollars bets in high efficiency vehicle technology. Today’s announcement is likely to provoke a long battle in the courts and create a tremendous amount of uncertainty. Meanwhile, suppliers in other countries will be racing ahead to help the rest of the world meet their obligations under the global climate accord.”
- “Our surveys show that suppliers see the current, strong fuel economy standards as good for jobs and good for investment. If there is one thing these companies need to thrive, it’s consistent, long-term targets.”

[Guest Column in Automotive News, 8/20/18](#)

- “The Trump administration's recommendation that America slam the brakes on improving pollution and fuel economy standards for cars and trucks will put our nation's automotive industry at risk.”
- “These days, any automaker that wants to ensure success has to offer cleaner, more efficient vehicles that can compete on the world stage. Strong, consistent standards create a level playing field and help them do this. Unraveling existing standards creates chaos and creates business uncertainty, undermining investments and long-term planning.”
- “When standards are set at aggressive but attainable levels — like the targets now on the chopping block — they spur technological innovation, catalyze competitiveness and support jobs.”

**Scott Bailey, CEO of Tula Technology, Inc.**, an American startup that developed the Dynamic Skip Fire technology which selects the best combination of engine cylinders to fire to match torque demand, delivering a 15-20% efficiency boost from conventional engines.

[Automotive News, 8/19/18](#)

- “The truth of the matter is, GM played a really large role in our ability to commercialize our product. They might have done that anyway, but I think it's highly likely that the federal standards that were in place helped facilitate their interest in exploring a new technology. . . . If we take away that pressure, we'd be struggling to get traction in the U.S. And perhaps the concept of Dynamic Skip Firing never makes it, or alternatively, since we believe in the concept, we would have just turned our attention immediately to Europe or Asia and focused efforts there. And perhaps Tula ends up growing up on another continent.”
- “But I know it was certainly beneficial for us to have a strong interest from a domestic manufacturer. And as a small company, it's a lot easier to work in your backyard than a couple continents away.”

**Aluminum Association President & CEO Heidi Brock**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “We are reviewing the draft rule in detail and continue to seek an outcome that maintains the competitiveness of U.S.-based suppliers, provides certainty to our automotive customers and ultimately helps produce better performing cars and trucks that consumers want to buy. As to weight and safety, leading auto safety experts agree, size—not weight—is the more influential safety determinant since bigger vehicles provide occupants more crush space in a crash. . . . In fact, NHTSA’s own data, which confirm weight can be reduced safely in more than 95 percent of light trucks and passenger cars to boost MPG, while maintaining or increasing safety. For the remaining 5 percent, those very small passenger cars weighing 3,200 pounds or less, it’s simply not credible to suggest automakers will be forced to lightweight them under any regulatory scenario—and automakers have made no such claims.”

**Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association, Executive Director Dr. Rasto Brezny  
(member of Automotive Technology Leadership Group)**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “We need the agencies and California to come together and find a compromise that would continue strong U.S. leadership in the clean mobility industry. . . . If the standards are significantly weakened, we introduce market uncertainty that will negatively impact supplier investments, jobs and innovation in the United States.”

**Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Senior Vice President of Government  
Affair Ann Wilson (member of ATLG)**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

“We will continue to work with the agencies and California to develop one national standard that maintains stability for our member companies. We believe continued progress in fuel efficiency and vehicle emissions standards will allow our country to remain a leader in the technologies that make cars and trucks cleaner and more efficient here and around the globe.”

**American Trucking Association, press secretary and vice president of public affairs Sean  
McNally**

[TruckingInfo, 8/2/18](#)

- “EPA’s announcement to lock in the 2020 light-duty fuel economy standards until 2026 will face a long litigious road if the agency and the 13 states and the District of Columbia that support increased light-duty fuel economy standards can’t resolve their differences.”

**National Grid, Electric Utility**

[Statement, 8/3/18](#)

- “National Grid continues to support the existing vehicle emission and fuel economy standards for vehicles made from 2022 to 2025 in order to reduce reliance on imported fuels, maintain a balanced energy mix, and reduce greenhouse gas and criteria air emissions. Greater adoption of electric vehicles and plug in electric hybrids is paramount in order to achieve all of these goals. For this reason, National Grid joined other utilities and states in challenging EPA’s determination that the existing emission standards for cars and trucks must be revised. The proposed rule released yesterday, the Safer and Affordable Fuel Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule, takes a significant step backwards. National Grid firmly believes that the existing standards are an integral component of decarbonizing the transportation sector and achieving a clean energy future.”

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

**Senator Tom Carper (D, DE)**

[Press Release, 8/2/18](#)

- For those who foolishly chose to undermine successful fuel economy standards, here are some facts. Our transportation sector is the largest source of carbon dioxide emissions. Blocking reasonable efforts to address the pollution that we know comes from the cars and trucks we drive is willful ignorance. Another fact is that, to be successful, any business needs certainty and predictability. What President Trump is proposing does just the opposite. American automakers are trying to compete in a global economy in which competitors are manufacturing more affordable and efficient vehicles because that is what consumers are demanding. By doubling down on the dirty vehicles of the past, President Trump is delivering yet another blow to automakers that have made clear that, going forward, they need to build vehicles for a world market and all 50 states.

**Senator Gary Peters (D, MI)**

- “We need one strong, national fuel economy standard based on solid science and data to continue driving our economic competitiveness, protect our environment and public health, and help address climate change. The Administration’s preferred option moves us in the wrong direction – crippling incentives for automotive innovation, creating uncertainty in the market and saddling consumers with higher fuel costs. In Michigan, we have the best engineers and autoworkers in the world, and I know that they can compete with anyone when it comes to emissions reduction and fuel economy.”

**Senator Sherrod Brown (D, OH)**

[NPR WOSU, 8/6/18](#)

- U.S. Sen. Sherrod Brown, D-Ohio, says the new EPA standards are bad news for the GM workers in Lordstown. With sales down, the Lordstown plant that makes the fuel-efficient Chevy Cruze is down to just one shift. By freezing the CAFE standards – the Corporate Average Fuel Economy requirement – companies could have less reason to build small cars like the Cruze.
- “The same day that GM laid off workers at the historic plant in Lordstown, we got word the same day that GM plans to build its new Chevy Blazer in Mexico. The company is bypassing American workers. It’s sending more jobs to Mexico,” said Brown.

**Rep. Debbie Dingell (D, MI-12)**

[Website, 8/2/18](#)

- “There are a variety of proposals put forward in this NPRM, with the most unacceptable being the flatlining fuel economy standards. Flatlining is harmful to American leadership and innovation, as well as the environment. We need strong, reasonable standards that increase year over year. Nobody can deny that strong fuel economy standards have kept our environment clean, reduced our dependence on foreign oil, and saved consumers money at the pump.

**Senator Debbie Stabenow (D, MI)**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “The President’s preferred action is not supported by our automakers, suppliers, workers, and consumers. The Administration’s decision to roll back fuel economy and emission standards moves us backward. Our automakers and workers are making the best vehicles in the world and these standards have helped push technology forward. We must work together to find agreement on one strong national standard supported by all states and stakeholders.”

**Senator Michael Bennet (D, CO)**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “Not a single person in Colorado has asked me to roll back #fueleconomy standards. I urge [President Trump] to rethink this decision and do what is best for the American people.”

**Senator Chuck Schumer (D, NY)**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “While big oil and China may cheer the Trump administration’s proposal to roll back fuel economy standards, American consumers and our kids will suffer by paying more at the pump and breathing in dirtier air. This misguided proposal will cost consumers billions at the pump and lead to uncertainty for domestic automakers—putting them at a competitive disadvantage compared to companies in China and elsewhere that are investing in cleaner cars.”

**Senator Ed Markey (D, MA)**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “This #BigOil-masterminded fuel economy rollback would mean an additional 2.2 billion metric tons of pollution by 2040 (equal to 43 coal-fired power plants) & cost consumers hundreds of billions in higher gas spending. Trump is steering us toward disaster.”

**Senator Kamala Harris (D, CA)**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “This Administration has put a target on California’s back — but we will not let them roll back the progress we’ve made to fight climate change.”

**Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick (R, PA-8)**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “We have a right to breathe clean air. Rolling back fuel economy standards threatens to substantially decrease air quality, increase the cost of fuel for American families, and harm our children and our seniors.”

**Rep. Don Beyer (D, VA-8)**

[E&E News, 8/3/18](#)

(Q&A Format) As a car dealer, what do you make of the Trump administration's proposal to weaken clean car standards?

- I’m very much against it. All through the '90s and 2000s, I was very much for increasing the CAFE standards. The reality is that from 1992 to 2008, the CAFE standard was stuck at 22 mpg. And every improvement in engineering went into making the cars faster and bigger, not fuel-efficient. Once Obama came in and raised it to 36 mpg, within two years everyone had adapted and come out with cars that met the new standards. I’d be very disappointed if the industry goes back on the pledge it made in the Obama years.
- And I’m totally against revoking California's waiver to do what it needs to do. It would be astonishingly hypocritical for my Republican friends, who insist decisions should be made as close as possible to people at the state level. If California wants to have cleaner air and less-polluting cars, they should be able to do it.

**House Democratic Whip Rep. Steny Hoyer (MD)**

Statement, 8/2/18

- “Intent on reversing every single policy the Obama Administration put in place to protect workers, consumers, public health, and the environment, today’s announcement shows that the Trump Administration is playing dangerous, partisan games with our nation’s energy security. This rollback of fuel economy standards not only will lead to consumers paying more at the pump but also to a stifling of innovation in our automotive industry.

**Rep. Scott Peters (D, CA-52)**

[Guest Column, The Hill, 8/8/18](#)

- Last week, the Trump administration announced its intent to roll back fuel efficiency standards for cars and trucks sold in the United States through 2026, and to eliminate states’ authority to set their own, more stringent pollution standards. The move is backward looking for American business, consumers and the environment.

- The leader has been the state of California. California has consistently led the way with bold clean energy goals and developed innovative solutions to address air pollution even before the Clean Air Act passed. Multiple states followed our lead. The Trump administration wants to jeopardize future progress that consumers demand.

## STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEADERS

**20 Attorney Generals, representing Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Washington, D.C.**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “Federal rules to limit tailpipe pollution and improve fuel economy are our best strategy to reduce carbon pollution, improve air quality, and save drivers money on gas. The Administration’s proposal to weaken these rules will cause the American people to breathe dirtier air and pay higher prices at the pump. If adopted, the Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s rollbacks will cost American drivers hundreds of billions of dollars. Freezing or weakening these standards puts the health of our children, seniors, and all communities at risk, and increases the rising costs of climate change for our states. This decision upends decades of cooperative state and federal action to protect our residents. We are prepared to go to court to put the brakes on this reckless and illegal plan.”

**Timothy Franquist, Air Quality Director, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality**  
[E&E News, 8/9/18](#)

- Arizona wants to maintain the aggressive standards established under former President Obama to avoid future regulations on air pollution, said Timothy Franquist, air quality director for the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). His office opposes Trump's plan to freeze the standards at 2020 levels.
- “We are going to talk the language of both aisles that this is bad for the health, bad for the economy.”
- “When we look at the sources that contribute to ozone, it’s motor vehicles by a large margin. We want to be able to solve the ozone problem at its source. Over-regulating job creators is simply not going to get us into attainment.”

**Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper**

[Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- “Colorado air already challenged by heat, wildfires, congestion. Why make worse? Why roll back emission standards? Truth: in end will cost drivers more AND make air quality worse. We will stick with cleaner, less expensive standards!”

**Massachusetts AG Maura Healey**

[Washington Post \(via AP\), 8/2/18](#)

- “This has to be absolutely one of the most harmful and dumbest actions that the EPA has taken,” said Healey of Massachusetts, one of the attorneys general from 19 states and the District of Columbia objecting to the change. “It’s going to cost drivers here and across the country hundreds of millions of dollars more at the pump.”

**New York Governor Andrew Cuomo**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- "In New York, we will resist the Trump administration's attempt to roll back our progress and block our right to require manufacturers sell Zero Emissions Vehicles. We stand with California and other states against the EPA's irresponsible attacks on our right to enforce critical emissions standards. And if the President implements this egregious proposal, we will pursue all legal means to protect our economy, our air quality and our children's future."

**Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “Once again, the Trump Administration is siding with big oil and gas companies over families in Pennsylvania. Today’s decision will mean small business owners paying more to transport their goods and get to job sites and families paying more to drive to work or their child’s school. This decision flies in the face of what’s best for consumers and the environment. The EPA’s action to weaken fuel economy standards hurts Pennsylvania’s consumers, workers, and everyone who wants to breathe cleaner air. Fuel economy standards are lowering gas bills, spurring innovation to create jobs, keeping air cleaner, and creating demand for cleaner domestic energy and renewable technology.”

**California Governor Jerry Brown**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “For Trump to now destroy a law first enacted at the request of Ronald Reagan five decades ago is a betrayal and an assault on the health of Americans everywhere,” said Governor Brown. “Under his reckless scheme, motorists will pay more at the pump, get worse gas mileage and breathe dirtier air. California will fight this stupidity in every conceivable way possible.”

[Letter to CARB Chair Mary Nichols, 8/1/18](#)

- “As you and I have discussed many times, bold action is required if we are to meet California’s climate goals. While the state has made significant progress in expanding the use of electric, hybrid and alternative-fuel vehicles, the transportation sector continues to be the largest single contributor of greenhouse gases released into our atmosphere.”
- “I am directing the California Air Resources Board to assess the viability of new regulations to increase zero emission vehicle adoption in fleets across the state.”

**California Air Resources Board Chair Mary Nichols**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “At first glance, this proposal completely misrepresents costs and savings. It also relies on bizarre assumptions about consumer behavior to make its case on safety. CARB will examine all 978 pages of fine print to figure out how the Administration can possibly

justify its absurd conclusion that weakening standards to allow dirtier, less efficient vehicles will actually save lives and money. Stay tuned for further comment. Meantime, California remains fully committed to a rigorous 50-state program with a full range of vehicle choices. That program is in effect right now and will remain so for the foreseeable future.”

### **Climate Mayors, a Coalition of 407 U.S. Mayors**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- Today, Mayor Garcetti and Climate Mayors from across America condemned the Trump Administration's new proposal to weaken vehicle efficiency standards and rescind California's waiver right to set strong greenhouse gas regulations — hindering U.S. efforts to curb auto emissions and the resulting air pollution.
- Climate Mayors — the national coalition of 407 U.S. Mayors dedicated to pursuing solutions to global warming — denounces this unprecedented attack on both the environment and states' rights, and vows to continue moving forward on transportation policies that help reduce the impact of climate pollution.

### **Hartford, CT Mayor Luke Bronin**

[Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- “As mayor of a city where a lot of kids suffer from asthma, this is going to have a real difference on the health and well-being of our kids and of our community,” he warns.
- “The cost to our climate is immeasurable, and the cost to our community can be measured, I think, in millions of dollars but also in its impact on children's lives,” Bronin adds.

### **Columbus, GA Mayor Teresa Tomlinson**

[Soundbite Services, 8/3/18](#)

- “This is affecting our kids with asthma, our seniors with COPD; it's affecting our quality of life. But if that doesn't inspire you for some reason, it's also making our automakers less competitive,” she warns.

### **Providence, RI Mayor Jorge Elorza**

[Soundbite Services, 8/3/18](#)

- “We shouldn't be rolling back these safeguards; we should, in fact, be expanding them to further protect them. This is something that definitely hits home. Even though it's being tackled at a national level, the rubber meets the road at the local level.”

### **Kirkland, WA Mayor Amy Walen**

[Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- Kirkland Mayor Amy Walen, who also runs a Ford/Hyundai dealership, says automakers already are meeting the benchmarks and Americans are buying more fuel-efficient cars. “The industry has proven that it can adapt and comply with standards that are put out there; and in some states, more aggressive goals have been set and those goals have been met. So, if we don't strive, we won't accomplish.”

**The US Climate Alliance, representing California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “We oppose efforts by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to weaken the nation’s clean car standards, and we strongly support the 18 jurisdictions representing 140 million Americans that are suing to defend these standards. We also support preserving State flexibility to adopt standards more protective than federal standards. Weakening the nation’s clean car standards will not only cost Americans more at the pump, but hurt children, senior citizens and people living with respiratory illness, and will impede the ability of our states to meet our own emission reduction targets.”

**National Association of Clean Air Agencies**

Statement, 8/2/18

- “NACAA opposes the proposal by EPA and NHTSA to roll back federal greenhouse gas (GHG) emission and fuel economy standards for passenger cars and light trucks and to rescind California’s authority under the Clean Air Act to set GHG emission and Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) standards. Weakening vehicle GHG emission standards by freezing them in place for six years – through 2026 – would eliminate important air quality and environmental improvements and harm public health. It has been well-documented that the technologies needed to meet the progressively more stringent Model Year 2021 to 2025 emission standards are already available and cost-effectively in use today. Discarding these standards, as proposed, would be unfounded and imprudent. Further, undermining California’s statutory authority to adopt its own clean car standards, and other states’ authority to adopt California’s standards, would be a direct attack on states’ rights and antithetical to the core principles of cooperative federalism. Two federal courts and half a century of EPA practice have rejected the notion that California’s GHG and ZEV standards are preempted by the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.”

FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

**Gina McCarthy, former EPA Administrator**

[Guest Comment in Automotive News, 8/2/18](#)

- This administration's decision had nothing to do with the record or the needs or wishes of our automakers or consumers. It won't do anything to bring certainty to the industry except increase business costs and confusion. And it is not a done deal; in fact, the process hasn't even started. There will need to be a full and transparent rule-making before the rule will change.
- The sole reason Pruitt and his EPA reopened this rule is their unwavering belief that rules are bad no matter what the benefit, and rules to address climate change are intolerable. There isn't any decision made during the prior administration that the current administration doesn't feel an overwhelming need to roll back. They view all rules, by definition, to be anti-business even when they were undertaken to provide essential public health and climate protections and would provide far more benefits than costs.

**Margo Oge, former Director of EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality**

[Guest Post in Forbes, 8/2/18](#)

- Although the auto industry had asked the Trump administration to relax these [Clean Car Standards] in 2017, Trump's move goes much further than what they asked, and is not necessarily welcome for the industry. After all, auto companies worked closely with the federal government to develop these standards in the first place.
- In helping to create the standards, the federal government and California believed – and the auto industry agreed – that this would help the industry become more competitive through advanced technologies that make today's cars more like smart phones than rotary phones, save the consumer an average of \$8,000 at the pump over the life of a vehicle, and save the planet the burden of another 6 billion tons of CO2.
- The Trump administration's move hurts jobs just as much as it threatens the planet. Much of the \$76 billion in capital invested by the auto industry since 2008 went to technologies that help reduce fuel consumption. Looking into the future, a recent analysis found that the Clean Car Standards will create more than 100,000 U.S. jobs in 2025 and more than 250,000 U.S. jobs in 2035.

#### [E&E, 8/1/18](#)

- In addition to a fight over the validity of the administration's safety analysis, the rollback could be legally vulnerable if it attempts to claim that car emissions are not a big contributor to greenhouse gas inventory, said Margo Oge, who headed EPA's transportation office under Obama. In 2017, the transportation sector accounted for more greenhouse gas emissions than power plants. It was the first time.
- "They would have a pretty big legal challenge that they are not paying the right attention on the analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions," she said. "They are going to have to say that the emissions from cars are not endangering public health and the environment, which they cannot do, downplaying climate analysis and air pollution."

#### [Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- "We're turning a pretty rare win-win program that took us years under President Obama, thousands of hours, and now we're turning it into lose-lose for everyone but the oil industry," she says.

### **Arnold Schwarzenegger, former California Governor**

#### [Twitter, 8/2/18](#)

- For 48 years - since one of my heroes, then-Governor Ronald Reagan, requested it - California has had a waiver from the federal government to clean our own air. If the President thinks he can win this fight, he's out of his mind.
- I am sick and tired of these fake conservatives who believe in states' rights to make their own policies - as long as state policy is to pollute more. If you want to clean up your air, they throw federalism right out the window. I've had it with so-called pro-business conservatives who ignore what actual industry leaders say is best for business. The car companies' own lobbyist said they hoped the administration would "find a solution that continues to increase fuel efficiency standards." Let's be clear: this is a stupid policy and no one asked for this. Businesses prefer certainty - not policies that change with the whims of each new White House.
- I hope some conservatives with a conscience will act in Washington to defend California's waiver based on these historic Republican values. But if not, I'd remind them that California has won this battle before. We will win again.

## **Anthony Foxx, former U.S. Secretary of Transportation**

[Newsweek Op-Ed, 8/2/18](#)

- To us Americans, our cars are more than just a means of transportation. They connect us to people, places and opportunities. Automobiles anchor our economy, supporting roughly seven million U.S. jobs—including vehicle manufacturers, suppliers, and dealers. They are the heart of American manufacturing and part of our innovative edge as a country. The role that automobiles play in shaping our air quality is also clear, and we can do more to make them even cleaner.
- Fuel efficiency for cars and light duty trucks is now at an all-time high, which means consumers are paying less at the pump. Carbon emissions from these vehicles has dropped by 21% since 2005—putting the industry on track to keep pace with the Obama administration’s targets under the Paris Accord for the United States to cut greenhouse emissions by 26-28% compared to 2005 levels.
- Despite these gains, however, the Trump administration is considering freezing future federal vehicle efficiency standards, an action that would create a different ripple effect: significant, costly and time-consuming litigation over California’s authority under the Clean Air Act to establish more stringent state standards.

## **Jeff Alson, former official in EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality**

[Guest Column, The Hill, 8/2/18](#)

- Over the previous decade, EPA’s technical staff published nearly 10,000 pages of analysis strongly supporting the car GHG standards. The comprehensive and sophisticated federal automotive technology analysis was developed using new tools recommended by the National Academy of Sciences, which had never been used by any regulatory agency.
- Now, instead of building on this historic work, EPA political leadership rubber-stamped a biased analysis of both the GHG and fuel economy standards cobbled together by the Department of Transportation (DOT) to provide a political rationale for what is essentially an eight-year freeze of the GHG standards.

[E&E, 8/2/18](#)

- "EPA staff had basically nothing to do with that entire document and analysis," Jeff Alson, a former staffer in EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality, told E&E News.
- "They put the EPA logo on specifically to deceive the American public to make it look like the agency technical staff was involved in the analysis and supports the analysis," Alson said in an interview. "But nothing could be farther from the truth."
- "They cooked the books," he said. "The PRIA has the EPA logo on it. But I will be telling people that EPA staff had basically nothing to do with that entire document and analysis."

**Former Obama Administration Officials—Jason Miller**, CEO of the Greater Washington Partnership, former Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of the National Economic Council; and **Shoshana Lew**, COO of the Rhode Island Department of Transportation, former CFO and Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs for the U.S. Department of Transportation

[Brookings Institute, 8/3/18](#)

- [T]he [Trump] administration is on a path that could needlessly upend a settled regulatory framework that has brought together disparate interests, delivered predictability to automakers, improved cars, and reduced pollution. As such, the proposed new rules run counter to what Ford, General Motors, and others across the industry have consistently advocated. In fact, industry and the state of California appear largely aligned on how to proceed in resetting fuel-efficiency standards, and the only missing player is the Trump administration, despite the president's prior direction to his team to negotiate.
- [T]he nation's successful fuel-efficiency framework of the last decade has been built on bipartisan, multi-stakeholder dialogue that debated differences, found solutions, and converged around the One National Program. In that spirit, a negotiated solution for the next era would retain steady increases in standards going beyond 2025, incentivize innovation throughout the industry, ensure vehicle safety, help consumers, and protect the environment. The federal rule-making process is built for such an approach, but only if federal agencies get serious and return to the negotiating table.

**Susan Helper, former Chief Economist of the Commerce Department; now Professor at Case Western Reserve University**

[Auto News, 8/7/18](#)

- [Helper] said the negative effects [of the rollback proposal] are likely understated.
- Cars may be cheaper up front for consumers but they'll use more fuel and cost more to operate under the easier standards, eating into consumer pocketbooks and hurting demand, she said. Longer term, walking away from higher fuel economy standards puts the U.S. at risk of losing high-value engineering work to China and Europe, which are marching ahead with tougher standards, she said.
- "That's really dangerous in terms of future competitiveness and making America great again," said Helper.

**Erica Groshen, former Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; now visiting senior scholar, Cornell's Industrial and Labor Relations School**

[Auto News, 8/7/18](#)

- The Transportation Department says that the fewer job-years should not be construed as meaning up to 60,000 jobs will be lost in the U.S. because the analysis measured labor need, not actual employment, and the jobs impacted could be overseas. The Department also believes that additional labor needs would largely be fulfilled by overtime, meaning losing additional man hours may not lead to job cuts.
- That still affects workers in question, said Erica Groshen, a former commissioner of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and during Obama administration.
- "A decline in hours does equate to a decline in earnings, either in the form of wages or in the form of a job," said Groshen

**Joel Mintz, former EPA official, Professor Emeritus of Law and the C. William Trout Senior Fellow in Public Interest Law at Nova Southeastern University College of Law**

[Guest Column, The Hill, 8/8/18](#)

- One example of the potential damage that a poorly crafted regulation may cause is the new proposal by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to roll back a requirement that automobile manufacturers improve vehicle fuel efficiency in the first half of the 2020s. [Then identifies proposal to revoke California waiver.]
- Both of these regulatory proposals are poorly supported and of questionable legality. The Trump rollback of vehicle emission standards directly contradicts a landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Massachusetts v. EPA*, which declared that greenhouse gases are a pollutant subject to EPA regulation. The rollback proposal also conflicts with an EPA finding that greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. Moreover, the standards were the result of a negotiation between the Obama White House and the auto industry, which is probably why there wasn't much clamoring from Detroit for a rollback.

**Mike Carr, former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. DOE**

[Guest Column, The Hill, 8/9/18](#)

- With the real value of a cleaner, more efficient car obscured to the consumer and the social value of avoiding consuming oil (itself heavily subsidized) hidden behind the tragedy of the commons, why should manufacturers make cleaner cars? Without standards, they simply don't. Not because they are evil but because there's no reason to innovate in the fundamental technologies that make cars better — their value just isn't recognized in the marketplace.
- Technology standards, like the ones President Trump has recently proposed to rollback, try to recognize some of this inherent value. In many ways, they still fall short of revealing the true value of disruptive technologies. What fuel economy (and air pollution) standards do, in essence, is make sure that companies are competing on more or less the same playing field. And in the international arena, they make sure our manufacturers don't become niche players that produce inefficient, dirty cars that only U.S. consumers (whose markets mask the true costs) are willing to buy.
- We flirted with this exact disaster 10 years ago and only made ourselves internationally relevant again by instituting new standards. Rolling them back now, just as the rest of the world, particularly China, is upping their technological game, is disastrously short-sighted.

**Letter to Acting Administrator Wheeler from Five Former EPA Air Chiefs: Roger Strelow, 1974-1977; David Hawkins, 1977-1981; Bob Perciasepe, 1998-2001; Gina McCarthy, 2009-2013; Janet McCabe (Acting), 2013-2017**

[Letter, via InsideEPA, 8/8/18](#)

- “Those of us signing this letter have each had the honor to lead the US Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Air, the office within EPA responsible for implementing the federal Clean Air Act. Decades of scientific research show that exposure to air pollution causes or exacerbates asthma, heart disease, cancer, and premature death and that reductions in air pollution save lives and improve daily quality of life for millions of

Americans. We worked for both democratic and republican administrations, and are proud of the progress this country has made towards cleaner air.”

- “[W]e have looked at the many Trump Administration Clean Air Act proposals and policies announced under the Clean Air Act since January 2017, including the most recent proposal to freeze fuel economy and tailpipe CO2 standards. We are hard pressed to find a single one that finds a different or better way to reduce air pollution. Some, like the effort to restore the loophole for super-polluting glider trucks, will unquestionably lead to more public health impacts. . . . The proposals we have seen, rather than finding better ways to meet the challenge, are stepping back from addressing harmful carbon pollution. The time invested in stepping back and the litigation likely to follow will impair our nation’s ability to deal with the inevitable hardships that are coming with a changed climate— hotter temperatures, more violent storms and flooding, more drought and wildfires. Again, the recent proposal on tailpipe and fuel standards is a compelling example. By all accounts, the auto industry, the state of California and other stakeholders are willing to discuss flexibilities and adjustments that will allow the industry to make continued progress towards cleaner, more efficient vehicles and improved public health, safety and economic vitality. We urge you to advocate strongly for those discussions to take place, constructively, before any final determination is made.”

## HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS

**Ten Health & Medical Organizations -- American Lung Association, Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Public Health Association, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Center for Climate Change and Health, Children's Environmental Health Network, Health Care Without Harm, National Association of County and City Health Officials and National Environmental Health Association**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- "Today's announcement reaches beyond efforts to weaken cleaner cars standards at the federal level—it also threatens states' right to limit dangerous vehicle pollution and take more aggressive steps to protect their residents. This action hampers not only California’s ability to protect the health of its citizens, but also that of a dozen other states that have driven nationwide progress in reducing tailpipe pollution, including Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington.”

**Dr. Georges Benjamin, Executive Director, American Public Health Association**

[Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- “This is absolutely a health and safety issue,” says Benjamin. “We know that reducing air pollution is a direct health hazard and not a theoretical one. This proposal by the administration will result directly in more heart attacks, more asthma attacks, more sick kids, and more spending out of our pockets for sick care.”

## CONSUMER ADVOCATES

### **Consumer Reports Op-Ed: Trump Administration Fuel Economy Freeze Would Cost Consumers**

[Consumer Reports, 7/30/18](#)

- “[C]onsumers overwhelmingly have benefited from improved fuel economy in cars and light trucks the last decade, as automakers invested in new engines, transmissions and other innovations that deliver more miles per gallon. These more efficient cars and trucks also emit less carbon dioxide—a key element of the strategy by the U.S. EPA, California, and other states to combat climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions.”
- **Jake Fisher, director of auto testing at Consumer Reports:** “Automakers have shown that they can make more efficient cars that can create more power and speed without dramatically raising the cost to consumers. With emerging technologies, including the expanded electrification of cars, consumers should be able to expect automakers to continue that progress in the years to come.”

### **Consumers Union Vice President of Advocacy David Friedman**

[Consumers Union Report, 8/2/18](#)

- “Boosting fuel economy can save fuel and lives. The justification for rolling back standards relies on inflated cost numbers and a failure to account for how automakers price entry level vehicles. Blocking all progress after 2020 and lowering pollution targets will undermine consumer savings, weaken our economy, and put the brakes on automaker innovation.”

[Consumer Reports, 7/30/18](#)

- “Study after study shows that improvements in fuel economy and auto safety go hand in hand. Today's cars are safer and they guzzle less gas, and that trend will continue if fuel economy standards are kept in place.”
- “Consumer demand for improved fuel economy is undeniable and automakers are failing to meet that demand. Automakers’ apparently successful efforts to get regulators to roll back fuel economy standards will only make the gap between what American car owners want and what automakers will deliver worse.”

### **Consumer Federation of America, Executive Director Jack Gillis**

[Press Release, 8/2/18](#)

- “Our latest report completely refutes the Administration’s flat-out wrong rationale for rolling back the standards. Safety is up, fuel economy is up and sales are up ... The truth is that today’s “all-new” vehicles are the safest, most efficient, most desirable cars, trucks and SUVs in history, and consumers are responding by buying them in record numbers... Fuel efficiency makes safety affordable.”

## LABOR

### **United Auto Workers (UAW) Regional Director Rich Rankin, based in Toledo**

[NPR WOSU, 8/6/18](#)

- Rankin in Toledo says CAFE standards played a part in driving innovation and efficiency at companies like Fiat Chrysler America.
- “I believe that that helps drive new industry and creates new jobs and forces these companies to look at these technologies which makes us all better in the state of Ohio,” Rankin said.

### **BlueGreen Alliance, Executive Director Kim Glas**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “Walking back from the nation’s current strong fuel economy standards is a mistake, plain and simple. For years the nation has reaped the benefits of these world-leading standards. Weakening these standards hits the brakes on American innovation and endangers jobs,” BlueGreen Alliance Executive Director Kim Glas said.
- “Automakers and suppliers have made billions of dollars in investments and created hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide ensuring that any vehicle a consumer chooses to buy—whether a car, truck, or SUV—gets more efficient every year. Strong standards keep that investment flowing and those jobs secure. Rolling them back means we lose ground in the race with China and other countries to design and build the best new vehicles and risk losing more American auto jobs to other nations,” Glas continued.

### **Leo Gerard, President of United Steelworkers and Rhea Suh, President of NRDC**

[USA Today Op-Ed, 8/2/18](#)

- “Our families, workers and country would be far better off if the administration would reconsider and maintain globally-leading standards... Getting more miles per gallon helps reduce our exposure to global oil price shocks we can neither control nor predict. It also reduces the dangerous carbon pollution that’s driving the central environmental challenge of our time — global climate change... The clean car and fuel economy standards are helping us do that, while at the same time helping us bring back America’s manufacturing leadership and jobs. We owe it to our workers, and we owe it to our children, to stay the course.”

### **Roy Houseman, Legislative Representative, United Steelworkers**

[E&E News, 8/7/18](#)

- “We're concerned that we know these standards are improving globally, and if we aren't careful, we'll allow other countries to capture this new technology investment, and they'll get a lot of the jobs that go with that.”

## NATIONAL SECURITY EXPERTS

### **American Security Project**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- “The announcement by the Trump Administration of the rollback of fuel efficiency standards is detrimental to our energy security and national security. Rolling back the clean car standards undermines the largest step we’ve taken as a nation to reduce our dependence on oil. Tearing down these standards will force Americans to spend more at the pump and make us more reliant on countries like Venezuela and Saudi Arabia.
- “The clean car standards don’t just reduce oil consumption—they’re also the best policy the U.S. has on the books to combat climate change. Just last year, the U.S. Energy Information Agency announced that transportation is now the largest source of greenhouse gases in the United States. The Defense Department has recognized climate change as a threat multiplier that accelerates instability across the globe while hampering our military’s readiness and ability to respond at home. We cannot afford to ignore this grave threat to our military and our nation. President Trump and his administration must change course and continue moving forward with these important and beneficial standards.”

### **Leo Cruz, Associate Director, National Security Action**

[Public News Service, 8/3/18](#)

- Leo Cruz, the associate director of communications and campaigns for the National Security Action, says the change would continue a pattern of the administration ignoring top military brass - who believe climate change is a well-established threat to the nation.
- In addition to the science, Cruz - a veteran who worked in the Defense Department - says the proposal also ignores the will of the voters.

“They voted for having America be 'great' - which means basic necessities of clean air, clean water. And rolling back regulations like these don't take us in that direction.”

## ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

### **Fred Krupp, President, Environmental Defense Fund**

[Bloomberg, 8/2/18](#)

- “This proposal will substantially increase pollution and will cost the average American family hundreds of dollars a year extra for gas. It’s a proposal that attacks the states’ right to protect people from dangerous pollution, one that no one -- not the American public, not the states, not even most automakers -- really wants, and one that’s being presented to the public under the false and easily discredited guise of improving public safety.”

### **Rhea Suh, President, Natural Resources Defense Council**

[Bloomberg, 8/2/18](#)

- “The clean car standards are already saving our families billions at the pump, supporting nearly 300,000 American jobs, and cleaning up dangerous tailpipe pollution. We need to speed up that progress, not slide backward.”

**Luke Tonachel, Director of the Clean Vehicles and Fuels Project, Natural Resources Defense Council**

[Opinion Column in The Hill, 8/4/18](#)

- President Donald Trump is turning his back on a trajectory of innovation that will create jobs, save consumers money at the pump, spur technological breakthroughs and, yes, help us address the looming threat of climate change. It's not the only thing we need to do, but it's a major, important step to address the nation's largest source of carbon pollution.
- This reversal doesn't make sense for anyone but the oil industry. Over the past six years, American auto buyers and American automakers have been in a golden age. Today's vehicles are more reliable and better to drive than ever before. They're also more efficient. New cars, SUVs and pickup trucks get, on average, 25 miles per gallon, about 23 percent more than a decade ago.

**Ken Kimmell, President, Union of Concerned Scientists**

[Statement, 8/2/18](#)

- This proposal is completely unacceptable. It's an attack on the climate, consumers, state governments and the future viability of America's auto industry. The Trump administration has decided to force America's drivers to spend more at the gas pump, burn millions more barrels of oil, and put us on a path to greater harm from climate change.

**Environmental Law and Policy Center Executive Director Howard Learner**

[Press Release, 8/2/18](#)

- "The Trump Administration's misguided decision to weaken clean car standards threatens to put U.S. automakers behind in the global competition for cleaner, fuel efficient cars and will hit consumers hard in the wallet when they fuel up... The existing standards would have saved families up to \$122 billion at the pump, saved more than 12 billion barrels of oil and kept 6 billion metric tons of dangerous carbon pollution out of the atmosphere... Trump's EPA and DOT weakened standards would needlessly put a cleaner environment and our children's future in the backseat."

ACADEMICS AND EXPERTS

*Legal*

**Jody Freeman, Director of the Harvard Law School Environmental and Energy Law Program**

[New York Times Op-ed, 8/2/18](#)

- "If the Trump administration succeeds in scuttling the federal standards and neutralizing California, it could be the most significant setback for American progress on climate change so far under President Trump. Worse, this disastrous policy could continue well beyond his tenure. Future presidents could not simply undo the decision, if courts rule

that the Trump administration’s interpretation of the law is categorically correct. In that case only Congress could restore California’s authority.”

**Ann Carlson, Faculty Director of the UCLA Emmett Institute on Climate Change and the Environment**

[Legal Planet Blog, 8/2/18](#)

- “[H]ere is the fundamental problem EPA/DOT face: how can EPA have said — as it has — that greenhouse gas emissions from cars endanger public health and welfare and then fail to regulate them to get those emissions to decline?”
- “The proposal to yank California’s waiver to issue its own standards, including its zero-emission vehicle program, is also legally weak. . . . The U.S. Supreme Court has already essentially rejected their view in [Massachusetts v. EPA](#). The Court held that the obligation to issue fuel economy standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is “wholly independent” of EPA’s environmental responsibilities under the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from cars in order to protect public health and welfare. The same reasoning makes clear that California’s power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act is “wholly independent” of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act’s ban on state regulation of fuel economy. The fuel economy statute does not, therefore, preempt California’s greenhouse gas regulations. Two [district courts](#) have already agreed with my analysis.”

**Ann Carlson and Cara Horowitz, Directors of UCLA’s Emmett Institute on Climate Change and the Environment**

[Washington Post Op-Ed, 8/2/18](#)

- “The EPA’s move to revoke California’s waiver is unprecedented in agency history and legally indefensible. . . . There’s no justification for revoking this waiver. Every presidential administration for 50 years has considered California’s air quality problems “compelling and extraordinary.” California’s climate problems are already on display: droughts, fires, sea level rise and the early melting of the Sierra snowpack that supplies much of California’s water. Transportation is the largest source of climate emissions for both California and the country. What could be more compelling than allowing the state to clean up its automotive fleet to eliminate the emissions causing these problems?”

**Michael Gerrard, Director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia University**

[E&E, 8/1/18](#)

- “Emissions are the central focus of the Clean Air Act, and so any decision that is founded on the Clean Air Act necessarily has to take a serious look at air pollution.”

**Vicki Arroyo, Executive Director, Georgetown Climate Center**

[NYT, 8/3/18](#)

“Transportation is extremely complicated and it really takes all levels of government working together,” said Vicki Arroyo, the executive director of the Georgetown Climate Center, who has been working with states on plans to cut emissions from transportation. If the federal government pulls back, she said, “it’s a tremendous setback.”

*Technical*

**Therese Langer, Transportation Program Director, American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy**

[Press Release, 8/2/18](#)

- “The Trump administration’s plan to roll back clean car standards will force Americans to pay more at the gas pump and increase air pollution that harms our health and the environment...[T]he administration would cause the owner of an average model year 2025 vehicle to fill up the gas tank 66 more times and drive up the cost of ownership by \$1,620 over the life of the vehicle. By 2035, the rollback would add at least 158 million metric tons of carbon dioxide to our air annually and increase US fuel consumption by 13.9 billion gallons per year... The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and US Department of Transportation’s (DOT) worse-than-expected plan flies in the face of science, years of research and technical analysis —and common sense.”

**Nic Lutsey, Engineer, International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT)**

[Bloomberg, 8/2/18](#)

- On the agencies’ justification for the proposed rollback: “This would be utterly unprecedented. Nobody in any regulatory agency has ever done a cost-benefit analysis anything like this,” said Nic Lutsey, an engineer at the International Council on Clean Transportation. “There’s no evidence that efficiency regulations have depressed sales and added fatalities as a result -- in any market in the world.”

**Dan Sperling, Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Davis, with Nic Lutsey of ICCT**

[Forbes Guest Column, 8/2/18](#)

- “The administration doubles down on their flawed cost assessment by contending that vehicle price increases associated with stricter CAFE standards will induce people to hold onto vehicles longer...there is no evidence of any such an effect... from an environmental perspective, this rollback increases climate-causing emissions by over 870 million tons of carbon dioxide. To our knowledge, there’s no single policy on the planet with this much climate impact...But the evidence shows that freezing CAFE standards is hard to justify on economic, social, environmental, or legal grounds.”

[Forbes Guest Column, 8/20/18](#)

- “Freezing CAFE standards disrupts automaker and supplier investment. If the proposed freeze actually happens, companies that lagged in making investments will be rewarded, those that led will be punished, and all will be discouraged from further investment.”
- “It’s hard for us to see how freezing CAFE helps the auto industry in the long run, when experts agree that the future will be dominated by electric cars and other fuel-efficient vehicles. Technological innovation is the lifeblood of any industry, and the broader economy with it. The Trump Administration’s proposed regulatory rollback would grind all this innovation to a halt.”

**Carla Bailo, President of the Center for Auto Research and member of the National Academies of Sciences**

[E&E News, 8/1/18](#)

- "It's hard to say what the logic is or what the thought is from the EPA in the Trump administration," said Carla Bailo, president for the Center of Automotive Research and a member of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine fuel economy committee. "I can't say that they're looking into it holistically and looking at all those factors. But what I can say is that they should be."

[E&E News, 8/7/18](#)

- "I think it's important that the administration listen to the key stakeholders, listen to those who actually have to manage in this global environment because automakers are all global."
- "This estimate on jobs impacts doesn't take into account what happens if, as a result of stepping away from the standards, the U.S. misses the boat on the next generation of technology. That would have even more of an impact."

**Tom Wenzel, Research Scientist, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory**

[E&E, 8/1/18](#)

- "I don't think anyone was trying to prevent this from being analyzed," Wenzel said. "We've done this study for many years. We've kind of resolved the issue that mass reductions do not inherently increase fatalities."

**Julian Marshall, University of Washington Professor of Engineering**

[E&E, 8/2/18](#)

- "It was surprising to me that my work would be cited in a proposal to argue that we should loosen the standards," Marshall told E&E News.
- "When you look at the kinds of activities that take place under the Clean Air Act — and vehicle emissions standards are one part of that — cleaning up the air produces strong benefits for public health," he said. "To be arguing we shouldn't be continuing to clean up the air, that's just not consistent with the evidence."
- "It's best that this data not get analyzed by people with political axes to grind. You get really concerned when people with political axes to grind analyze something in order to find what they want to find."

**John M. DeCicco, Research Professor, University of Michigan Energy Institute**

[Bloomberg, 8/2/18](#)

- DeCicco . . . said the rollback amounted to a "denial of basic science and a denial of American automakers' engineering capabilities and ingenuity."
- "Michigan's automakers have the technology and intellectual capital needed to meet ever-tighter MPG and GHG emission targets. The standards are designed with flexibility in mind, and have already adjusted to the shift back to SUVs and other light trucks," DeCicco said.

**Daniel Schrag, Director of Harvard University's Center for the Environment**

[E&E News, 8/7/18](#)

- The rollback of the vehicle efficiency rules is one of Trump's most consequential actions on climate, observers have said. Schrag said the administration's proposal shows that it is not fully considering the implications of its actions.
- “I think it is pretty clear that they care only about immediate impact on existing businesses that they are close to. If you don't care about the long-term future, then climate change is not as much of a worry.”

*Economics*

**Antonio Bento, Professor of Public Policy and Economics, University of Southern California**

[NY Times, 8/2/18](#)

- On the overall proposal: “I don’t know how they are going to defend this analysis,” said Antonio M. Bento, a professor . . . whose research is cited throughout the document. “I just don’t think it’s correct.”
- On the Administration’s argument that “the Obama-era fuel economy standards . . . would add about \$1,900 to the average cost of a new car”: “I think they are substantially overestimating the impact here,” Dr. Bento said.

[Washington Post, 8/4/18](#)

- Trump administration officials seemed to have “cherry picked” the effects that would lead to the conclusion they wanted: That more efficient cars would be more expensive and lead to more traffic fatalities.
- But Bento, whose work was referenced throughout the analysis, said the real-world evidence doesn’t support such an assumption.
- Bento also took issue with the way the government calculated fatalities, using what he called “very simplified assumptions” that ignore the dispersion of the weight of vehicles in a crash and tying safety largely to the age of a vehicle. In addition, he said that administration officials essentially cut the climate-related benefits of higher fuel economy standards “down to nothing.”
- As for the analysis overall: “I do not think it’s defensible. I do not think the assumptions as a whole are correct.”

**Kenneth Gillingham, Associate Professor of Economics, Yale**

[NY Times, 8/2/18](#)

- Gillingham, a Yale economist, points out that the Trump rollback proposal cited one of his papers, which inferred a larger rebound effect from changes in oil prices, but ignored some more recent studies, including one that he led, that found a much smaller effect.
- There’s also some evidence, Dr. Gillingham said, that the rebound effect shrinks as Americans get richer, which suggests that this should be less of a problem in the future — an argument that the Trump proposal rejected.
- “I think it’s fair to say that their number is at the high end,” Dr. Gillingham said. “And there are several arguments they dismissed that could bring it down.”

**Arthur van Benthem, Professor Business Economics & Public Policy, University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School**

[E&E News, 8/6/18](#)

- “These automakers, they don't just operate in the U.S. They also sell cars everywhere all over the world. Standards are tightening in Europe, in Japan and China.”
- So it's likely a lot of the technology to raise mileage will be developed anyway, he said. That's a fixed cost for the car companies, and they can transport some of what they develop to the U.S. market.
- “There's good reason to believe a lot of the costs will be lower once you factor that international landscape in,” van Benthem said.

**Mark Jacobsen, Associate Professor of Economics, University of California, San Diego**

[E&E News, 8/6/18](#)

- Automakers don't always raise the price of cars relative to the costs of meeting fuel economy standards, said Mark Jacobsen, associate professor of economics at the University of California, San Diego. They often have price points they're trying to meet for specific markets. To make up for added technology costs, he said, they might reduce horsepower, make smaller cars or cut luxury trims to shrink overall costs.
- “It would be perfectly possible to make a car that's fuel efficient and yet didn't increase in costs. People might be sacrificing something else. But it's not that the manufacturers have to make the car more expensive to meet the rule.”
- It's also unclear whether the government's claim about car prices rising this year is connected to the Obama-era rules on fuel efficiency, he said. The gross domestic product is also on the rise.
- “It's not all that surprising people are spending more money on cars. Part of it is for fuel economy, but part of it is for luxury items and electronics and things as well.”

## EDITORIAL BOARDS

### **Automotive News - Editorial**

[Automotive News, 8/13/18](#)

- Thanks in part to the regulations — and automakers' ingenuity — consumers have ever more choices of vehicles and powertrains, including turbo-4s and V-6s that do the work of V-8s, nine- and 10-speed transmissions, hybrids galore, plus a smattering of long-range electric cars that can be recharged at home.
- The Trump administration's proposed retreat from those standards doesn't have to mean the end of that progress. Fuel efficiency may not be a powerful marketing hook (except everywhere else in the world), but fuel consumption isn't a sacred duty, either. Automakers owe no debt to Big Oil. Their obligation is to the consumer, who benefits from the cleaner air, long-term cost savings and, yes, expanded choice brought about by the development of fuel-efficient vehicles.
- The auto industry knows that the way forward isn't to go backward or stand still. Even if the Trump administration won't be part of it, there's ample opportunity for a sensible compromise between the industry and clean-air advocates that preserves the industry's good name and sustains the current pace of progress.

### **Los Angeles Times Editorial Board**

[LA Times, 8/2/18](#)

- Of all the Trump administration's assaults on the environment, there may be none more destructive than the decision to weaken fuel economy standards and let cars, passenger trucks and SUV burn more gas and spew more tailpipe pollution.
- Worse, the Trump plan seeks to revoke California's longstanding legal authority to set its own standards for cleaner vehicles. If successful, the Trump administration would be stunting decades of progress in California and other states toward cleaner, healthier air, and it would be hobbling the worldwide effort to combat climate change.

### **The New York Times Editorial Board**

[NYT, 8/2/18](#)

- The Trump administration's decision to try to weaken President Barack Obama's landmark 2012 agreement to increase fuel efficiency and decrease global warming emissions from automobiles is dismaying on so many levels that it is hard to know where to begin.
- The proposal from the current administration would freeze the average fuel economy after 2021 at about 37 miles per gallon; the Obama-era rule would have required automakers to hit an average of about 54 miles per gallon by 2025. The Trump plan would also revoke a waiver that the federal government granted to California, which allows the state to set stricter standards because of its particular air pollution problems.
- To justify the unjustifiable, the Trump administration is deploying a series of bogus arguments that freezing the Obama standards would prevent nearly 13,000 traffic fatalities. That number stands in stark contrast to the Obama administration's conclusion that its standards would lower fatalities by 100.

### **San Antonio Express-News Editorial Board: Rolling back car pollution rules is a bad idea**

[Express-News, 8/20/18](#)

- The Trump administration's plan to freeze future anti-pollution and fuel economy standards is so bad, even auto manufacturers are against it.
- Instead of aiming for the sky, pushing for innovation and ingenuity, President Donald Trump's plan would freeze average fuel economy after 2021 to 37 miles per gallon. This would be down from 54 miles per gallon in 2025, under an agreement reached in 2012 with President Barack Obama.