



# Fact Sheet

DPC Staff Contact: Ryan Mulvenon (202) 224-3232  
DPC Press Contact: Barry Piatt (202) 224-0577

May 13, 2010

Available Online: [dpc.senate.gov](http://dpc.senate.gov)

## The Consequences and Significance of the Murkowski Disapproval Resolution

In *Massachusetts v. EPA*<sup>1</sup>, the Supreme Court (Court) considered whether the Bush Administration's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had the statutory authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles and, if so, whether the reasons cited by the Bush Administration's EPA for refusing to do so were consistent with the *Clean Air Act*.

In his April 2007 majority<sup>2</sup> opinion, Justice Stevens<sup>3</sup> stated that, "judged by any standard, U. S. motor-vehicle emissions make a meaningful contribution to greenhouse gas concentrations." The majority opinion also stated that a "well-documented rise in global temperatures has coincided with a significant increase in the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere" and that "respected scientists believe the two trends are related."

The Court held that the Bush Administration's EPA failed to make a reasoned, statutory judgment in its refusal to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles. The Court also stated that greenhouse gases "fit well within" the *Clean Air Act's* definition of an "air pollutant." The Court therefore ordered EPA to adhere to the statutory requirements of the *Clean Air Act* by making a determination about whether greenhouse gases could "reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare" pursuant to Section 202 (a) of the *Clean Air Act*.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The petitioners included the states of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, cities, and private organizations.

<sup>2</sup> Justice Stevens was joined by Justices Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg and Breyer in the majority opinion. Chief Justice Roberts filed a dissenting opinion that was joined by Justices Scalia, Thomas, and Alito. Justice Scalia also filed a dissenting opinion that was joined by Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Thomas and Alito.

<sup>3</sup> In 1970, President Nixon nominated Stevens for the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. President Ford nominated him to be a Supreme Court Justice in 1975 and he was confirmed by the Senate 98 to 0. [http://www.senate.gov/reference/resources/pdf/603\\_1975.pdf](http://www.senate.gov/reference/resources/pdf/603_1975.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> The law states that the EPA Administrator "shall by regulation prescribe (and from time to time revise)...standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution ... which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare."

In December 2007, following the Supreme Court’s decision, EPA scientists and legal staff, in consultation with other senior Bush Administration officials, developed a “draft endangerment finding for greenhouses” which found that greenhouse gases may “reasonably be anticipated to endanger public welfare” (endangerment finding).<sup>5</sup> The Bush Administration did not finalize this finding but it did contain many of the same points that supported the current EPA endangerment finding.

In July 2008, the Bush Administration requested four months of public comment on the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions under the *Clean Air Act* (through an advance notice of proposed rulemaking). This decision effectively left the responsibility of adhering to the *Massachusetts v. EPA* decision to the next administration.

In a related manner during the same time period, the Bush Administration considered whether it would provide a *Clean Air Act* waiver to California to allow it to enforce its adopted greenhouse gas emission standards for new motor vehicles. The California standards were more stringent than the federal fuel economy standards. In December 2007, EPA notified California that it would deny its request to enforce the new standards because California did not have a “need to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions.” This decision received high-levels of attention because “it was the first time that EPA denied a formal waiver request outright, and it also was the first time EPA used the compelling and extraordinary conditions criterion in the *Clean Air Act* as the basis for denying a waiver request.”<sup>6</sup>

On January 21, 2009, California requested that the EPA reconsider its earlier decision to deny the *Clean Air Act* waiver request. President Obama subsequently ordered the EPA to reconsider whether its denial “was appropriate in light of the *Clean Air Act*.”

In April 2009, the EPA responded to the *Massachusetts v. EPA* decision with the following proposed finding:

- The emission of six greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations; and
- The combined emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons from new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines contribute to the atmospheric concentrations of these key greenhouse gases and hence to the threat of climate change.

This judgment was based on scientific findings which show:

---

<sup>5</sup> Environmental Protection Agency, Response to January 22, 2009 Freedom of Information Request HQ-RIN-00574-09, October 13, 2009, [http://www.eenews.net/public/25/12762/features/documents/2009/10/13/document\\_pm\\_04.pdf](http://www.eenews.net/public/25/12762/features/documents/2009/10/13/document_pm_04.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Government Accountability Office, “Clean Air Act: Historical Information on EPA’s Process for Reviewing California Waiver Requests and Making Waiver Determinations,” January 16, 2009, <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-09-249R>

- Concentrations of greenhouse gases are at unprecedented levels compared to the recent and distant past;
- The effects of climate change observed to date and projected to occur in the future will have impacts on the public's health and welfare; and
- Emissions of greenhouse gases from on-road vehicles regulated by the *Clean Air Act* contribute to climate change.

One month later, in the wake of this proposed finding and EPA's ongoing reconsideration of California's *Clean Air Act* waiver request, President Obama announced that the EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) would propose setting the first ever joint federal greenhouse gas and fuel economy program. In response, California agreed to treat compliance with the new federal standards as compliance with the state's standards through Model Year 2016, and industry agreed to stop litigating against the California's standards. In June 2009, the EPA granted California's request for a *Clean Air Act* waiver which preserved its ability to enforce stricter greenhouse gas motor vehicle emission regulations beginning in 2016.

In December 2009, the EPA returned to its proposed endangerment finding after a 60-day comment period, two public hearings, and review of 380,000 public comments. EPA Administrator Jackson's subsequent review of those comments and the scientific evidence prompted her to sign the endangerment finding, which became effective on January 14, 2010.

On January 21, 2010, under the authority granted to Congress by the *Congressional Review Act*, Senator Murkowski introduced a resolution to disapprove and thus invalidate EPA's endangerment finding. The potential approval of this resolution would have major consequences for the nation and represent a significant departure from science. The following information outlines those consequences and the significance of the possible approval of the Murkowski resolution.

## ***Consequences***

The approval of the Murkowski resolution would prevent the EPA from issuing its portion of the joint federal greenhouse gas and fuel economy program because the endangerment finding is a legal prerequisite of the EPA's portion of the joint rule.

The inability of the EPA to issue its portion of the regulations for that program would have significant consequences (enumerated below). Eliminating the EPA standard would forfeit a third of the greenhouse gas emissions reductions projected to result from last year's agreement between the Obama Administration, the states, and the nation's

automakers and autoworkers.<sup>7</sup> In fact, wiping out the EPA standard would undo last year's historic agreement.

If that were to happen, California and at least thirteen other states<sup>8</sup> that have adopted California's greenhouse gas emissions standards would likely respond by enforcing their standards within their jurisdictions,<sup>9</sup> leaving the automobile industry without the explicit nationwide uniformity that it believes is important to its business.<sup>10</sup>

The approval of the Murkowski resolution would result in the United States' failure to:

- Save 1.8 billion barrels of oil (78 billion gallons) over the life of the regulated vehicles;
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 960 million metric tons of total carbon dioxide equivalent over the life of the regulated vehicles;
- Save consumers over \$3,000 worth of fuel over the life of a 2016 regulated vehicle; and
- Save the nation at least \$250 billion in lifetime benefits of the national program.

## ***Significance***

The approval of the Murkowski resolution would also represent a significant departure from science and weaken America's and the Senate's leadership on the issue of climate change. The National Academy of Sciences has concluded: "It is unequivocal that the climate is changing, and it is very likely that this is predominantly caused by the increasing human interference with the atmosphere. These changes will transform the environmental conditions on Earth unless counter-measures are taken."<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, scientists at the thirteen agencies comprising the U.S. Global Change Research Program have reported that unchecked greenhouse gas emissions pose significant risks to the wellbeing of the American public.<sup>12</sup> This departure from science

---

<sup>7</sup> 74 Fed. Reg. 49453, 49478-82 (September 28, 2009) (639 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> avoided by NHTSA rule; 947 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e avoided by EPA rule).

<sup>8</sup> Arizona, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington.

<sup>9</sup> Letter from Mary Nichols, Chairman, California Air Resources Board, to Administrator Lisa Jackson and Secretary Ray LaHood (May 18, 2009) (<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/regulations/air-resources-board.pdf>).

<sup>10</sup> Letter from Alan Reuther to Members of Congress, Legislative Director, United Autoworkers, (March 15, 2010).

<sup>11</sup> Statement by the National Academy of Sciences of the United States and the Science Academies of Twelve Other Nations (May 2007) ([http://www.nationalacademies.org/includes/G8Statement\\_Energy\\_07\\_May.pdf](http://www.nationalacademies.org/includes/G8Statement_Energy_07_May.pdf)).

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Global Change Research Program, *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States* (2009) (<http://downloads.globalchange.gov/usimpacts/pdfs/climate-impacts-report.pdf>).

which the Murkowski resolution represents is opposed by elected officials, Attorneys General, environmental agency commissioners, health groups, faith leaders, clean air advocates, and scientists.

Adopting the Murkowski resolution would also be a step backwards for the Senate, which has declared on a bipartisan basis that greenhouse gas accumulation from human activity poses a substantial risk of increased frequency and severity of floods and droughts.<sup>13</sup> A vote to disapprove the endangerment finding would also be viewed by some as a vote which positions the United States behind China on the issue of climate change,<sup>14</sup> and puts the United States more in line with the position of Saudi Arabia.<sup>15</sup>

## **Letters**

The following are excerpts of letters from an array of groups and elected officials opposing the Murkowski disapproval resolution.

Elected Officials:

*“Instead of embracing the progress of state and local governments to combat climate change, efforts to block all or part of the Clean Air Act would seriously undermine the overwhelming science of climate change and further exacerbate impacts to national security and public health and welfare. Additionally, these efforts hold back billions of dollars in job-creating clean energy investments all across the country. America has the ability to lead the world in growing the clean energy economy but our continued dependence on fossil fuels does nothing to drive investments in the clean energy and efficiency programs needed to spur local economic development and job growth.”*

*--United States Conference of Mayors, March 1, 2010*

*“Instead of embracing this progress and following the lead of states like California to combat pollution, a resolution or amendment to block all or part of the Clean Air Act would turn our back on the overwhelming science of climate change and further exacerbate, rather than solve, the crippling uncertainty facing industry and holding back billions of dollars in job-creating clean energy investments all across the country.”*

---

<sup>13</sup> S. Amt. 866 to H.R. 6, *Energy Policy Act of 2005* (motion to table amendment rejected on June 22, 2005; bill passed in the Senate on June 28, 2005).

<sup>14</sup> Speech by President Hu Jintao (September 22, 2009) (“Global climate change has a profound impact on the survival and development of mankind.”); Statement by China State Council (November 26, 2009) (“Appropriate handling of the climate change issue is of vital interest to China’s social and economic development and people’s fundamental interests, as well as the welfare of all the people in the world and the world’s long-term development.”).

<sup>15</sup> Statement by Lead Climate Negotiator Mohammad Al-Sabban (December 3, 2009) (“[T]here is no relationship whatsoever between human activities and climate change.”).

*--California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, January 21, 2010*

*“The EPA’s proposed greenhouse gas standards for motor vehicles will establish a nationally-harmonized state and federal program that is supported by the auto industry, environmental organizations and states. If EPA is blocked from adopting these rules, individual states will move forward with our own vehicle standards.”*

*--Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, March 8, 2010*

*“The benefits of taking action to address climate change – creating clean energy jobs, fostering energy independence, and reducing pollution – are clear. Overturning the EPA’s authority to reduce greenhouse gases would be a step backward on all these fronts.”*

*--Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick, March 17, 2010*

*“Over the past decade, in the absence of federal leadership, Illinois and other visionary states have worked diligently to curb greenhouse gas emissions... Rather than supporting this progress and enhancing Illinois’ and other states’ efforts to protect a healthful environment, a resolution or amendment to block the Clean Air Act would severely undermine the scientific consensus of climate change and impede both public and private-sector initiatives to create jobs in clean energy industries and invest in green technologies. While I strongly support comprehensive federal energy and climate legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, without such legislation, the U.S. EPA must pursue regulation as directed by Congress under the Clean Air Act.*

*--Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, March 22, 2010*

*“Given Maine’s prominent role in addressing climate change, I urge that you oppose any Resolution or Amendment offered by Senator Murkowski or others that would restrict the hard-fought ability, established through years of effort by Maine’s Attorney General and Department of Environmental Protection, to move forward with controls on greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act.”*

*--Maine Governor John Baldacci, May 19, 2010*

Attorneys General:

*“The time is long overdue for the federal government to take action to drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to prevent disruptive climate change. The anticipated Murkowski amendment and/or the CRA resolution*

*would be not only giant steps backward, but would needlessly delay reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that we can and should begin making today.”*

- Rhode Island Attorney General Patrick Lynch, January 19, 2010*
- Vermont Attorney General William H. Sorrell*
- California Attorney General Edmund G. Brown*
- Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal*
- Delaware Attorney General Joseph R. Biden III*
- New Mexico Attorney General Gary King*
- Corporation Counsel of the City of New York*

*“At the outset, it must be explained that the Endangerment Finding was not a form of bureaucratic over-reach by EPA but, rather, was the fulfillment of a United States Supreme Court decision, Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007), in which many of the undersigned states participated, and of specifically-delegated authority granted by Congress. EPA was required to evaluate, under Section 202 of the Clean Air Act, whether emissions of carbon dioxide endangered public health or welfare. EPA did what the Supreme Court and statute required it do.”*

- Rhode Island Attorney General Patrick Lynch, June 9, 2010*
- Vermont Attorney General William Sorrell*
- California Attorney General Edmund Brown*
- Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal*
- Delaware Attorney General Joseph R. Biden, III*
- New Mexico Attorney General Gary King*
- Massachusetts Attorney General Martha Coakley*
- New Hampshire Attorney General Michael Delaney*
- Maryland Attorney General Douglas Gansler*
- Arizona Attorney General Terry Goddard*
- Iowa Attorney General Thomas Miller*

#### Automobile Manufacturers and Autoworkers:

*“If these resolutions are enacted into law, the historic agreement creating the One National Program for regulating vehicle fuel economy and greenhouse gas emissions would collapse. The Alliance believes that the One National Program resolution fostered by the Obama Administration is critical to the efficient regulation of motor vehicles greenhouse gas emissions and related fuel economy in the United States, not only for the 2012-2016 model years, but also for the 2017 model year and beyond. The ongoing existence of a national program for motor vehicles fuel economy and greenhouse gas standards for all future model years should be the shared goal of not only the Administration and the industry, but also Congress and the States, for the benefit of the environment, the public, and the ability of the industry to create and maintain high quality jobs.”*

- Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, March 17, 2010*

*“The UAW also is deeply concerned that overturning EPA’s endangerment finding would unravel the historic agreement on one national standard for fuel economy and greenhouse gas emissions for light duty vehicles that was negotiated by the Obama administration last year. As a result of this agreement among all stakeholders, NHTSA and EPA are proceeding with a joint rulemaking effort that will result in significant reductions in fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by 2016.”*

*--United Auto Workers, March 15, 2010*

#### Business Leaders:

*“As members of Environmental Entrepreneurs (E2), we urge you to oppose Senator Murkowski’s resolution of disapproval (S.J. Res. 26) or any similar bill that blocks or suspends action by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to tackle global warming. This resolution would weaken the Clean Air Act, hobble efforts to hold major carbon emitters accountable, and eliminate incentives for innovations that could drive a clean energy economy.”*

*“E2 represents a national community of 850 businesses leaders who promote strong environmental policy to grow the economy. We are entrepreneurs, investors, and professionals who collectively manage over \$20 billion of venture capital and private equity, and have started well over 800 businesses which in turn have created over 400,000 jobs.”*

*--Environmental Entrepreneurs, May 13, 2010*

*“In the midst of the catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico, the U.S. Senate can choose to support a resolution, S.J. Res. 26, which bans the EPA from protecting the environment from oil and gas pollution. The resolution would consequently increase our dependence on oil and thwart investment in the clean energy technologies of tomorrow.”*

*-- Business for Innovate Climate and Energy Policy, June 9, 2010*

*“Last week, I had the great pleasure to join the President, senior Administration officials, Members of Congress and leaders from major industry, environmental, labor and public groups at the White House. The event focused on the effort to create a first-ever program to address the fuel efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions of commercial vehicles.”*

*“The broad support of this announcement is a testament to the open and collaborative process by EPA over the past year to develop this regulation. The major stakeholders are at the table and working together with the Agency – which is exactly the type of public-private partnerships needed to address*

*complex issues. Passage of the resolution would delay this historic effort and prevent us from achieving the national environmental, economic and energy benefits that will come from addressing commercial vehicles.”*

*--Tim Solso, Chairman and CEO of Cummins Inc., May 2010*

#### National Security and Veterans Organizations:

*“America’s dependence on oil hurts our economy, finances our enemies, and threatens our security. The U.S. spends over \$1 billion a day to feed an addiction that tethers us to dangerous and unstable regimes. Much of that money ends up in the hands of terrorist organizations. The need to obtain foreign sources and secure shipping lanes also puts the men and women of our armed services in harm’s way. Now is not the time to sideline a key weapon in the fight against our addiction to oil from hostile nations.”*

*--Operation Free, April 14, 2010*

#### Western Climate Initiative:

*“Disapproving EPA’s endangerment finding would be a reputation of sound science. Also, as the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers pointed out in their March 17th letter to you, disapproving EPA’s endangerment finding would remove the authority for new emissions standards for light duty vehicles. As you know, EPA and the Department of Transportation’s National Highway Safety Administration (NHTSA) have finalized an historic national program that will dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. EPA’s endangerment finding is a prerequisite to these new vehicle standards. At a time when the United States is striving for energy security, federal regulations that will result in improved fuel economy and reduced vehicle emissions are essential. Congress should not support a resolution or other actions that would block improvements in air quality and fuel efficiency.*

*--Western Climate Initiative, April 21, 2010*

#### Agricultural and Rural Organizations:

*“Support for Senator Murkowski’s resolution to block EPA regulation of greenhouse gases would be a vote against the health and security of our nation’s farms and of the livelihoods of our farmers. Fears that farmers and ranchers would be unduly burdened by these regulations appear to be not only short-sighted, but incorrect. The EPA has already proposed to tailor the rules to exempt small carbon emitters and hold accountable only large emitters who have long been subject to similar standards for other pollutants, which by all accounts would exclude most farms and ranches.”*

--Alabama Sustainable Agriculture Network, March 2, 2010  
--Appalachian Sustainable Development  
--Beyond Pesticides  
--California Certified Organic Farmers  
--California Climate and Agriculture Network  
--Center for Rural Affairs  
--Family Farm Defenders  
--Food and Water Watch  
--Iowa Environmental Council  
--Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy  
--Island Grown Initiative  
--Kansas Rural Center  
--League of Rural Voters  
--Michael Fields Agricultural Institute  
--Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Service  
--National Organic Coalition  
--National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition  
--Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society  
--Nebraska Wildlife Federation  
--Northeast Organic Farming Association Interstate Council  
--Organic Valley  
--Pesticide Action Network North America  
--Rodale Institute  
--Rural Advantage  
--Slow Food USA  
--The Organic Center

Former EPA Administrators:

*“In its 2007 ruling, Massachusetts V. EPA, the Supreme Court affirmed the EPA’s authority to regulate greenhouse gases, declaring that these emissions “fit well within” the Clean Air Act’s definition of an air pollutant.” The subsequent endangerment finding, based on the conclusions of scientists in both the Obama and George W. Bush Administrations, determined that greenhouse gases endanger human health or welfare and must therefore be regulated under the law.”*

*In executing her responsibilities, the current Administrator appears to have taken a measured approach and demonstrated a sensitivity to economic concerns, proposing a schedule under which regulations would not kick in until 2011 and then only for the largest and dirtiest polluters. Additional permitting requirements would not come into play before 2016, giving the Senate ample time to address the issue through legislation.”*

--Russell E. Train, EPA Administrator 1973-1977, May 24, 2010.

Environmental Agency Commissioners:

*“As environmental agency commissioners in States that have adopted the California Clean Cars standards, we are writing to express our concern with the Resolution of Disapproval recently introduced by Senator Murkowski of Alaska that would invalidate the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency finding of endangerment for greenhouse gases. Many of our States have previously expressed opposition to this Resolution because it would represent a denial of the overwhelming scientific evidence of real and urgent threats to human health and welfare posed by climate change, and would strip the nation of a proven, effective tool to begin to address this threat.”*

*--Mary Nichols, California Air Resources Board, February 23, 2010  
--Amey Marrella, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection  
--David Littell, Maine Department of Environmental Protection  
--Laurie Burt, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
--Ron Curry, New Mexico State Environment Department  
--Pete Grannis, New York Department of Environmental Conservation  
--Dick Pedersen, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
--W. Michael Sullivan, Rhode Island Dept. of Environmental Management  
--Ted Sturdevant, Washington Department of Ecology*

*“As environmental regulators from states active in developing and implementing climate change initiatives, we believe that GHGs must be reduced in the most cost-effective manner. We have developed and will continue to implement cost-effective state-level policies and programs, including energy efficiency and renewable energy standards, which will complement USEPA’s regulatory efforts. Together, these efforts will accelerate investment in low-carbon technologies to help ensure that our local economies remain globally competitive while achieving the pollution reductions needed to stabilize atmospheric GHG concentrations and avoid catastrophic and irreversible harm from climate change.*

*However, we cannot meet this monumental challenge without fair and strong federal action to curb GHG emissions that is based on sound science. Nearly three years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that GHGs are pollutants under the CAA, which if found by USEPA to be detrimental must be regulated. USEPA has now complied with the court’s mandate and, after rigorous scientific review, determined that GHGs endanger public health and welfare and must be controlled under the Act. While the legislative debate continues, Congress must respect the science and allow USEPA to proceed with its efforts to put the nation on a path toward effectively addressing climate change.”*

*--Mary Nichols, California Air Resources Board, January 15, 2010.  
--Amey Marrella, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection  
--Douglas Scott, Illinois Environmental Protection Agency*

--David Littell, Maine Department of Environmental Protection  
--Laurie Burt, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
--Jim Sygo, Interim Director, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality  
--Mark N. Mauriello, New Jersey Department of Environmental Quality  
--Ron Curry, New Mexico State Environment Department  
--Pat Grannis, New York Department of Environmental Conservation  
--Dick Pedersen, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
--Ted Sturdevant, Washington Department of Ecology  
--Matthew Frank, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

#### Health Groups:

*“The Senate must not vote to ignore the scientific evidence and reject its clear conclusions. The Clean Air Act mandates that the Environmental Protection Agency follow the science and then implement the law accordingly. The Resolution of Disapproval is a cynical attempt to disregard the science and block the enforcement of the Clean Air Act.”*

--American Lung Association, January 26, 2010

*“Given the serious public health implications of increasing greenhouse gas concentrations, we believe overturning EPA’s endangerment finding is bad public health policy, and simply bad public policy.”*

--American Public Health Association, January 19, 2010  
--Association of Public Health Laboratories,  
--National Association of County and City Health Officials,  
--National Environmental Health Association,  
--Physicians for Social Responsibility,  
--Trust for America’s Health

*“Some of the public health effects of climate change cited in EPA’s announcement include: increased likelihood of more frequent and intense heat waves, more wildfires, degraded air quality, more flooding, increased drought, more intense storms, harm to water resources and harm to agriculture. Given the serious public health implications of increasing greenhouse gas concentrations, we believe overturning EPA’s endangerment finding is bad public health policy.”*

--American Academy of Pediatrics, February 23, 2010  
--American College of Preventive Medicine  
--American Public Health Association  
--American Thoracic Society  
--Association of Public Health Laboratories  
--Association of Schools of Public Health  
--Children’s Environmental Health Network

- Hepatitis Foundation International
- National Association of County and City Health Officials
- National Environmental Health Association
- Physicians for Social Responsibility
- Trust for America's Health

*“The EPA’s findings, issued on December 7, 2009, state that six key greenhouse gases are a threat to public health and welfare. Science shows that greenhouse gases are the major force behind climate change. Nurses recognize the major health and safety implications of climate change, including: severe weather events and injuries from these events, increased heat-related illnesses and vector-transmitted diseases, and threatened food and water supplies. Nurses support and advocate for public policies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the recognition of the novel, global challenges expected as climate change evolves.”*

-- American Nurses Association, June 9, 2010

#### Faith Leaders:

*“It is only appropriate that the CAA continue to oversee any and all air-related challenges that we face. In 2007, the Supreme Court ruled that greenhouse gas emissions, the leading cause of climate change are, in fact, covered under the CAA and could be regulated by the EPA.”*

- Church World Service, January 19, 2010
- Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life,
- Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach,
- The Episcopal Church,
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,
- Friends Committee on National Legislation,
- Jewish Council for Public Affairs,
- Jewish Reconstructionist Federation,
- National Council on Churches USA,
- Maryknoll Office of Global Concerns,
- Presbyterian Church (USA) Washington Office,
- The Missionary Oblates, Justice Peace/Integrity of Creation Office
- Union for Reformed Judaism,
- Unitarian Universalist Ministry for Earth,
- Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations,
- The United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries
- United Methodist Church – General Board of Church and Society,
- United Methodist Women

#### Clean Air Advocates:

*“We firmly believe that Congress should respect the Supreme Court decision and EPA’s deliberative and thorough process in coming to its conclusion about GHGs. Accordingly, NACAA opposes any attempt to overturn the finding by EPA that GHGs endanger public health and welfare and we urge you to do the same.”*

*--National Association of Clean Air Agencies, January 20, 2010.*

#### Scientists:

*“The CAA is a law with a nearly 40-year track record of protecting public health and the environment and spurring innovation by cutting dangerous pollution. This effective policy can help address the threat of climate change—but only if the EPA retains its ability to respond to scientific findings.”*

*--Union of Concerned Scientists (signed by 1,806 endorsers), May 2010*

#### Environmental Groups:

*“In its landmark Massachusetts v. EPA decision of 2007, the Supreme Court ruled that greenhouse gases are covered by the Clean Air Act, and that EPA is required to regulate them if found to endanger public health and welfare. In issuing its subsequent 'endangerment finding' of 2009, the EPA relied on decades of evidence, research by hundreds of the world’s leading scientists, and numerous other sources including many agencies of the U.S. government. Overwhelming scientific evidence shows clearly: Climate change due to manmade pollution is real and dangerous.”*

*--ISKY, February 25, 2010*

*--Audubon*

*--Center for Biological Diversity*

*--Clean Air Task Force*

*--Clean Water Action*

*--Defenders of Wildlife*

*--Earthjustice*

*--Environment America*

*--Environmental Defense Fund*

*--Friends of the Earth*

*--Greenpeace*

*--Natural Resources Defense Council*

*--Physicians for Social Responsibility*

*--Sierra Club*

*--Southern Environmental Law Center*

*--The Wilderness Society*

*--World Wildlife Fund*

*“The National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and our over four million members and supporters, I am writing to urge you to oppose Sen. Murkowski’s resolution (S.J. Res. 26) or any other proposal which seeks to undermine, limit, or otherwise delay use of the Clean Air Act to reduce pollution that contributes to climate change.”*

*--National Wildlife Federation, March 2, 2010*

*“I am writing to urge you to oppose Senator Murkowski’s disapproval resolution aimed at delaying congressional action on climate legislation and compromising the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce harmful global warming pollution. Senator Murkowski’s resolution would eliminate EPA’s authority to regulate carbon dioxide under the Clean Air Act as directed by the Supreme Court in 2007. While the stated intention of the Senator’s effort is to protect U.S. economic interests, the fact is, this resolution will stymie U.S. efforts to create jobs, new manufacturing opportunities and economic growth.”*

*--Phyllis Cuttino, Director, U.S. Global Warming Campaign  
Pew Environment Group, January 29, 2010*

*“On Thursday Senator Murkowski will ask you to join her in making sure that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) cannot protect the public health and welfare. Her resolution (S.J. Res. 26) would prevent EPA from taking any steps to control the greenhouse gas pollution that industry is dumping into the environment daily, and repeal important fuel economy agreements that have already been made. The science shows that global warming pollution is endangering the public health and welfare, and the law requires EPA to act to protect the public. Quite clearly, a vote for the Murkowski Resolution is a vote for more pollution.”*

*-- The Wilderness Society, June 9, 2010*

#### Climate Equity Alliance:

*“Low-income and minority communities are already the most vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change, so protecting these communities from global warming pollution is critically important. For example, climate change is predicted to cause more frequent and intense heat waves and other extreme weather events that negatively impact public health. Vulnerable low-income and minority populations will face especially great risks. And as urban populations continue to grow in low-lying areas that are vulnerable to storm events, flooding, and sea-level rise, communities of color whose populations are concentrated in these areas will be disproportionately impacted.”*

*--Green For All, March 3, 2010.*

*--Center for Budget and Policy Priorities*

- Center for American Progress Action Fund
- Service Employees International Union
- The United Methodist Church – General Board of Church and Society
- Union for Reform Judaism
- Community Action Partnership
- Washington Office of Public Policy, Women’s Division, United Methodist Church
- Coalition of Human Needs
- National Low Income Housing Coalition
- Friends Committee on National Legislation
- National Council of Churches USA
- Enterprise Community Partners
- Jewish Council for Public Affairs
- Franciscan Action Network
- Green DMV
- Network Lobby
- National Hispanic Environmental Council

Native American Organizations:

*“Until legislation is forthcoming that is enacted by Congress and the President that addresses the needs and concerns of Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages with respect to greenhouse gas emissions, the National Tribal Environmental Council strongly urges you to oppose Senator Murkowski’s Resolution and any similar efforts to derail EPA efforts to regulate such emissions under the Clean Air Act. Common sense dictates that the Clean Air Act remain as a viable tool for helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and ultimately stem and reduce the adverse impacts of climate change.”*

*--National Tribal Environmental Council, March 1, 2010.*

Civil Rights, Communities of Color, and Low-Income Organizations:

*“On behalf of the NAACP, our nation’s oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots–based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and its endangerment finding that is required under Clean Air Act that greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may reasonably be anticipated both to endanger public health and to endanger public welfare.”*

*--NAACP, February 26, 2010*

*“Senator Murkowski’s resolution will undercut the Clean Air Act and severely jeopardize our ability to protect public health in our communities, fight global warming, and transition America to a clean energy economy. To protect public health and welfare, especially in our nation’s most vulnerable communities, it is*

*essential that President Obama and EPA use the Clean Air Act to reduce global warming pollution.”*

- 350.org, March 2, 2010*
- African American Environmentalist Association*
- BIG: Blacks in Green*
- Campus Progress*
- Center for Biological Diversity*
- Center for Environment, Commerce & Energy*
- Center For Equitable Education*
- Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment*
- Children's Earth Day*
- Citizens Campaign for the Environment*
- Citizens Climate Lobby*
- Citizens Utility Board of Wisconsin*
- Clean Wisconsin*
- Climate Collaboration Network of Corporate Ethics International*
- Climate Ground Zero*
- Coal River Mountain Watch*
- Common Ground for Conservation*
- Community Environmental Defense Council, Inc.*
- Dakota Resource Council*
- Delaware Riverkeeper Network*
- Earthjustice*
- EARTHWORKS*
- Ecology Center*
- Environment Ohio*
- Fresh Energy*
- Garfield Foundation*
- Global Exchange*
- Global Green*
- Greenpeace*
- GreenTreks Network, Inc.*
- Gulf Restoration Network*
- Hargett Resources, Inc.*
- Haverhill Environmental League*
- Hip Hop Caucus*
- Institute for Local Self-Reliance*
- La Onda Verde de Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)*
- League of Conservation Voters*
- LEAP (Lexington Environmental Action Project)*
- Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper*
- McClure River Restoration Project*
- Midwest Environmental Advocates*
- Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy*
- Montana Environmental Information Center*
- National Council for Science and the Environment*

- *National Latino Congreso*
- *NC WARN (Waste Awareness and Reduction Network)*
- *New York Public Interest Research Group*
- *New Yorkers for Sustainable Energy Solutions Statewide*
- *No Biomass Burn*
- *North Fork Ranch*
- *Northeast Ohio Gas Accountability Project*
- *NYC Environmental Justice Alliance*
- *Onondaga Creek Conservation Council*
- *Onondaga Creek Kids*
- *Oregon Center for Environmental Health*
- *Owegl Revitalization Betterment Corporation (ORBC)*
- *Peakville Citizens Coalition*
- *People Organized in Defense of Earth and her Resources (PODER)*
- *Plains Justice*
- *Protecting Our Waters*
- *Student Environmental Action Coalition*
- *Summit Lake Association for Preservation*
- *Sustainable Energy & Economy Network*
- *Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services*
- *The Angel Winds Energy Association, LLC*
- *The Committee to Preserve the Fingerlakes*
- *Three Rivers Waterkeeper*
- *UNEP (United Nations Environmental Programme) Youth Network*
- *University of Montana Environmental Studies Program*
- *URI, Mid-Hudson Valley Cooperation Circle*
- *Valley Watch, Inc.*
- *Voices For Earth Justice*
- *Washington Wildlife Federation*
- *Western North Carolina Alliance*
- *Wittenberg Center for Alternative Resources*
- *Women's Environment and Development Organization*