Vincent J. Brisini  
Deputy Secretary for Waste, Air, Radiation and Remediation  
Office of Waste, Air, Radiation and Remediation  
Rachel Carson State Office Building  
P.O. Box 2063  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2063

Dear Mr. Brisini,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) proposed carbon pollution emission guidelines for existing stationary sources, better known as the Clean Power Plan. As the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) finalizes its comments on the EPA’s proposal, I would ask that you keep these considerations in mind.

I. The DEP’s comments will be critical to ensuring that the final version of the Clean Power Plan contains adequate protections for Pennsylvania’s interests.

As the primary environmental regulator for a state that will be critical to the success or failure of achieving the targeted overall reduction in carbon dioxide, the DEP’s comments will likely carry significant weight with the EPA. While many policymakers, including myself, will be submitting comments on the Clean Power Plan, the DEP is uniquely positioned to opine on the technical details and feasibility of the proposed targets for Pennsylvania. As the EPA prepares to revise the Clean Power Plan before its final promulgation next year, the DEP’s comments represent the last best chance to protect Pennsylvania’s overall interests.

II. The DEP should provide the EPA with analysis on whether the projected state goals are feasible.

Based on its significant experience with managing air programs among the Commonwealth’s fleet of electric generating units, the DEP will be able to provide specific analysis on the feasibility of the EPA’s proposed goals for Pennsylvania. Where the EPA’s analysis of the Clean Power Plan primarily considered the feasibility of implementation nationwide, DEP can provide specific analysis for feasibility in Pennsylvania.
For example, the DEP should provide information on whether the heat rate improvement targets are reasonable, in light of the physical condition of Pennsylvania’s coal-fired electric generating unit (EGU) fleet, including a review of EGUs that have already undertaken the envisioned capital investments. The analysis should also consider whether the EPA’s proposed shift from coal-fired EGUs to natural gas combined cycle, renewable, and nuclear sources are achievable without resulting in unacceptably high electric prices. Finally, the DEP should offer specific information on the realistic probability of achieving the proposed target for use of renewable sources, particularly solar and wind, given Pennsylvania’s climate and terrain.

III. The DEP should emphasize the importance of the Clean Power Plan being compatible with protecting Pennsylvania jobs.

As part of the state’s policymaking apparatus, DEP should strongly advocate for the EPA to pursue policies that will protect jobs in Pennsylvania. In the proposed rule, the EPA noted that local circumstances and state policy goals may be considered in the development each state plan, provided that the state plan complies with federal minimum requirements. Unlike some states with no affected sources or that have little fossil fuel deposits, Pennsylvania is home to many coal-fired EGUs and coal mines that feed them. This makes it critical that the final version of the rule provides sufficient flexibility for Pennsylvania’s state plan to protect jobs in impacted industries.

Thank you again for receiving feedback before finalizing the department’s comments to EPA on the proposed Clean Power Plan. This listening session has continued the DEP’s practice of maintaining open communication as the EPA has developed the Clean Power Plan. When the time comes for the DEP to work on a state plan to implement the new regulations, I hope for the practice to continue.

Sincerely,

Dave Reed
State Representative
62nd Legislative District