

**MUST...**

**KILL...**

**COAL**

**ATI V. EPA**

**(SIERRA CLUB/ALA EMAIL)**

**PRODUCTIONS AS OF**

**12/23/13**

Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US

03/28/2012 07:47 AM

To: Michael Goo

cc

bcc

Subject: Re: Will EPA's greenhouse regs wipe out coal?

(b) (5)

A

**From:** Michael Goo

**Sent:** 03/28/2012 06:43 AM EDT

**To:** barron.alex@epa.gov

**Subject:** Fw: Will EPA's greenhouse regs wipe out coal?

So there it is "small amounts of generation in 2030."

**From:** POLITICO Pro [politicoemail@politicopro.com]

**Sent:** 03/28/2012 06:19 AM AST

**To:** Michael Goo

**Subject:** Will EPA's greenhouse regs wipe out coal?

## **Will EPA's greenhouse regs wipe out coal?**

By Erica Martinson

3/28/12 6:16 AM EDT

Nothing to see here, the EPA said Tuesday as it downplayed the impact of its proposed climate change regulations for new power plants.

The agency says it's just riding the wave of the energy market, where natural gas is already pulling market share from coal. And the EPA is banking on gas's low price to mollify an otherwise rough transition for the nation's energy market into an era of reduced greenhouse gas pollution.

But opponents say the rule will strike a death blow to the coal industry.

The rule requires new coal-fired power plants to capture and sequester their carbon dioxide emissions, cutting CO2 emissions to the level of a combined-cycle natural gas-fired power plant.

Unlike natural gas, carbon capture and sequestration is quite costly.

The rule will chart a path to a cleaner and more diverse energy system, said Environmental Defense Fund attorney Megan Ceronsky. It also "sends an incredibly strong message," she said.

John Coequyt  
<[john.coequyt@sierraclub.org](mailto:john.coequyt@sierraclub.org)>

08/16/2012 04:33 PM

To: Michael Goo, Alex Barron

cc

bcc

Subject: Fwd: [CLEAN-STRATEGY] Coal to Remain Viable, says EPA's McCarthy at COAL-GEN Keynote

Pants on fire.

John Coequyt  
Cell. 202.669.7060  
Direct. 202.675.7916

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Lyndsay Moseley <[Lyndsay.Moseley@lung.org](mailto:Lyndsay.Moseley@lung.org)>  
**Date:** August 16, 2012 2:57:09 PM CDT  
**To:** "clean-strategy@lists.usclimatenetwork.org" <[clean-strategy@lists.usclimatenetwork.org](mailto:clean-strategy@lists.usclimatenetwork.org)>  
**Subject:** [CLEAN-STRATEGY] Coal to Remain Viable, says EPA's McCarthy at COAL-GEN Keynote  
**Reply-To:** Lyndsay Moseley <[Lyndsay.Moseley@lung.org](mailto:Lyndsay.Moseley@lung.org)>

FYI

## Coal to Remain Viable, says EPA's McCarthy at COAL-GEN Keynote

Louisville, Ky.  
Aug 15, 2012  
By Lindsay Morris  
Associate Editor

"Coal will continue to provide more of America's electricity than any other fuel source, producing nearly 40 percent of generation in 2035," said Gina McCarthy during the keynote session of COAL-GEN in Louisville, Ky. on Aug. 15. McCarthy, assistant administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Office of Air and Radiation, remained positive about the future of coal as it transforms into a cleaner source of generation in order to comply with several proposed or finalized EPA regulations.

The other keynote speakers who spoke on the future of coal generation were John Voyles Jr., vice president of transmission and generation, Louisville Gas & Electric; Pierre Gauthier, president & CEO, Alstom U.S. and Canada; and Greg Graves, president & CEO, Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co.

The Electric Power Research Institute estimates that the coal-fired power industry will invest \$275 billion in retrofits through 2035. The need for upgrades is driven by several EPA regulations, including the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS), the Cross State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) and the proposed New Source Performance Standard for greenhouse gases.

The potential greenhouse gas standard has been met with heated debate among power generators, who would have to install carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology in order to reach compliance. The EPA has received over 2 million comments from the industry as a result of the proposed rule-making, McCarthy said.

"While it's a significant economic lift, (the proposed standard) will provide investment for new technologies," McCarthy said. "CCS is technologically viable."

However, Gauthier said that technology to comply with the proposed carbon limit "is not waiting in the wings

**Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US**

Sent by: Georgia Bednar

02/27/2009 11:04 AM

To Beth Craig, bruce.nilles, david.bookbinder, Richard Ossias,

Steve Page

cc

bcc

Subject Coal Plant Permits

### Meeting

Date 03/02/2009

Time 04:00:00 PM to 04:45:00 PM

Chair Bob Sussman

#### Invitees

Required Beth Craig; bruce.nilles; david.bookbinder; Richard Ossias; Steve Page

#### Optional

FYI

Location 3407 ARN

Meeting: Coal Plant Permits

Time: 4 - 5 PM (ET)

Date: Monday, March 2, 2009

Location: 3407 ARN

#### EPA Attendees:

Bob Sussman

Steve Page

Richard Ossias

#### Sierra Club Attendees:

David Bookbinder

Bruce Nilles

Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US

03/24/2009 12:26 PM

To Beth Craig

cc Steve Page

bcc

Subject Re: Power Plant Information

Thanks Beth. yes, we should definitely have a follow-up discussion.

Robert M. Sussman  
Senior Policy Counsel to the Administrator  
Office of the Administrator  
US Environmental Protection Agency

Beth Craig

Dear Bob, Attached for your review is f...

03/23/2009 04:39:44 PM

From: Beth Craig/DC/USEPA/US  
To: Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: page.steve  
Date: 03/23/2009 04:39 PM  
Subject: Power Plant Information

---

Dear Bob,

Attached for your review is follow up information from our meeting with the Sierra Club on power plant permitting. We have attached background information on the process which has been used in the past to comment on permits. We also provided a short summary description on each of the permits.

Looking forward to having a discussion about this document and next steps. Thanks, Beth

[attachment "power plants march 23rd.doc" deleted by Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US]

Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US

04/15/2011 10:35 AM

To "Paul Balserak", "DavidA Evans"

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: coal plant efficiency

**From:** John Coequyt [John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org]

**Sent:** 04/07/2011 05:43 PM AST

**To:** Alex Barron

**Subject:** Re: Follow up

Bruce cites these three studies:

See, e.g., [http://www.npc.org/Study\\_Topic\\_Papers/4-DTG-ElectricEfficiency.pdf](http://www.npc.org/Study_Topic_Papers/4-DTG-ElectricEfficiency.pdf)

<http://www.epa.gov/nsr/ghgdocs/electricgeneration.pdf>

[http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/ImpCFPPGHGRdctns\\_0410.pdf](http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/ImpCFPPGHGRdctns_0410.pdf).

Many of these studies document efficiency improvement options that exceed 7 per cent.

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

From: Barron.Alex@epamail.epa.gov

To: "John Coequyt" <john.coequyt@sierraclub.org>

Date: 04/05/2011 01:01 PM

Subject: Follow up

Can you pass along that info you were going to send?

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>

04/29/2011 02:35 PM

To: Michael Goo, Alex Barron  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Zombie's

Michael and Alex:

Attached is a list of plants that the companies said were shelved because of uncertainty around GHG regulations. If a standard is set that these plants could meet, there is a not small chance that they company could decide to revive the proposal.

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916



C: 202.669.7060 Defeated Plants - GHG - 2011.xls

Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US  
04/29/2011 07:51 PM

To: Shannon Kenny, Paul Balserak, Al McGartland, DavidA  
Evans  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Fw: Zombie's

----- Forwarded by Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US on 04/29/2011 03:44 PM -----

From: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
To: Michael Goo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 04/29/2011 02:35 PM  
Subject: Zombie's

---

Michael and Alex:

Attached is a list of plants that the companies said were shelved because of uncertainty around GHG regulations. If a standard is set that these plants could meet, there is a not small chance that they company could decide to revive the proposal.

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916



C: 202.669.7060 Defeated Plants - GHG - 2011.xls



Lena Moffitt  
<Lena.Moffitt@sierraclub.org>

07/29/2011 04:24 PM

To Alex Barron

cc

bcc

Subject Have a second to talk NSPS?

Wanted to check in with you to see where things stand. We've been a bit out of the loop over here with John on vacation. I'll be at my desk till 5 if you have a minute.

Lena Moffitt  
Washington Representative  
Sierra Club  
(202) 675-2396 (w)  
(505) 480-1551 (c)

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org  
>

08/17/2011 11:35 AM

To: Alex Barron  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Can we chat today

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>

08/17/2011 04:51 PM

To: Alex Barron  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Check this out

<http://www.sierraclub.org/environmentallaw/coal/plantlist.aspx>

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>

09/07/2011 12:04 PM

To: Alex Barron

cc

bcc

Subject: You are looking at this, right?

<http://www.sierraclub.org/environmentallaw/coal/plantlist.aspx>

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org  
>

09/07/2011 01:09 PM

To: Alex Barron  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Numbers

Here is the official word from the Beyond Coal Campaign. You can cite us for internal use for sure.

153 defeated / 26 progressing (under construction or construction complete).  
We are projecting at least 70 percent success rate on the remaining 69  
projects (likely higher)

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

John Coequyt  
<John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
>

09/07/2011 01:32 PM

To: Alex Barron  
cc  
bcc  
Subject: Re: Numbers

Those were not for "permitted plants", but we are very worried that as many as a third of the ones that are in the permitting process - but for which construction has not commenced - will get built, e.g. up to 15-20 additional coal plants.

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

-----Barron.Alex@epamail.epa.gov wrote: -----  
To: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
From: Barron.Alex@epamail.epa.gov  
Date: 09/07/2011 01:10PM  
Subject: Re: Numbers

Is this for permitted facilities?

From: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
To: Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 09/07/2011 01:09 PM  
Subject: Numbers

Here is the official word from the Beyond Coal Campaign. You can cite us for internal use for sure.

153 defeated / 26 progressing (under construction or construction complete). We are projecting at least 70 percent success rate on the remaining 69 projects (likely higher)

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US  
09/07/2011 02:28 PM

To John Coequyt  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Re: Numbers

Do you know the percentage for plants that already have a permit?

John Coequyt Those were not for "permitted plants", b...

09/07/2011 01:32:43 PM

From: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
To: Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 09/07/2011 01:32 PM  
Subject: Re: Numbers

---

Those were not for "permitted plants", but we are very worried that as many as a third of the ones that are in the permitting process - but for which construction has not commenced - will get built, e.g. up to 15-20 additional coal plants.

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

-----Barron.Alex@epamail.epa.gov wrote: -----  
To: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
From: Barron.Alex@epamail.epa.gov  
Date: 09/07/2011 01:10PM  
Subject: Re: Numbers

Is this for permitted facilities?

From: John Coequyt <John.Coequyt@sierraclub.org>  
To: Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 09/07/2011 01:09 PM  
Subject: Numbers

Here is the official word from the Beyond Coal Campaign. You can cite us for internal use for sure.

153 defeated / 26 progressing (under construction or construction complete). We are projecting at least 70 percent success rate on the remaining 69 projects (likely higher)

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
DL: 202.675.7916  
C: 202.669.7060

John Coequyt  
<john.coequyt@sierraclub.org>

04/10/2012 04:11 PM

To Joseph Goffman, Rohan Patel, Michael Goo, Jonathan Lubetsky

cc

bcc

Subject FYI. GA Power Plant Development

Hey guys:

I just wanted to give you all heads up on a development in GA that is at the intersection of MATS and NSPS. Our local folks think that the developer is expecting a check when this plant gets it's permit and after the NSPS came out he reversed course and worked to settle the lawsuit ASAP. We do not expect the plant to proceed past the permit stage. The developer is not doing press because he can't answer questions about financing and when he expects to begin construction.

[http://action.sierraclub.org/site/MessageViewer?em\\_id=234606.0](http://action.sierraclub.org/site/MessageViewer?em_id=234606.0)

## Proposed Ben Hill Coal Plant Cancelled

### *Power4Georgians in Tenuous Position on Plant Washington After Legal Agreement*

Atlanta, GA – Clean air advocates and environmental groups won a victory today when Power4Georgians (P4G), the only company trying to develop expensive new coal plants in Georgia, agreed to cancel the proposed Ben Hill coal-fired power plant. The company also agreed to comply with critical new safeguards against mercury pollution and invest \$5 million in energy efficiency and renewable projects. The Sierra Club, the Fall Line Alliance for a Clean Environment (FACE), Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE), and the Ogeechee Riverkeeper, represented by the Southern Environmental Law Center and GreenLaw, successfully challenged the permit for Plant Washington issued by the Georgia Department of Environmental Protection, and the settlement agreement is pending approval by each group. If built, Power4Georgians' Plant Washington will have to meet the much more protective emission standards for mercury and other air toxins.

"Before we challenged the permit, Plant Washington was going to send forty times more mercury into our air and water each year, endangering our most vulnerable citizens," said Colleen Kiernan, Director of the Georgia Chapter of the Sierra Club. "We knew the law was on our side, we challenged Power4Georgians, and now Georgia's air, water, and people will be protected."



Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US

06/20/2012 02:10 PM

To John Coequyt

cc Jonathan Lubetsky

bcc

Subject Re: Fwd: Carbon Rule Comments for EPA from Change.org

Does this contain what you need?

<http://epa.gov/carbonpollutionstandard/pdfs/howtocomment.pdf>

John Coequyt

Jonathan and Alex: Can you help out h...

06/20/2012 01:41:48 PM

From: John Coequyt <[john.coequyt@sierraclub.org](mailto:john.coequyt@sierraclub.org)>  
To: Jonathan Lubetsky/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Alex Barron/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 06/20/2012 01:41 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Carbon Rule Comments for EPA from Change.org

---

Jonathan and Alex:

Can you help out here. Attached are the petition's from Change.Org, many of which were signed before the comment period officially opened. They want to make sure you all include them in your tally of supporters. Who do I need to give these to.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marie Bergen** <[marie.bergen@sierraclub.org](mailto:marie.bergen@sierraclub.org)>  
Date: Wed, Jun 13, 2012 at 4:45 PM  
Subject: Carbon Rule Comments for EPA from Change.org  
To: John Coequyt <[john.coequyt@sierraclub.org](mailto:john.coequyt@sierraclub.org)>

Hey John,

Here are the comments to send to the EPA on Carbon. Please let me know if you receive them.

Thanks!

--

Marie Bergen  
Regional Online Manager, Coal Campaign  
Sierra Club  
[415-9775673](tel:415-9775673)

--

John Coequyt  
Sierra Club  
[202-669-7060](tel:202-669-7060)