From: McKaughan, Colleen
To: Lyons, Ann; Lee, Anita
Subject: RE: I am attaching the list of the Jan NGS Calls to Tribes
Date: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:35:00 PM

I think you should try to be there – however the timing of all of them is still unknown! I'm also realizing that Jared needs talking points. I'm starting on those tonight.

From: Lyons, Ann
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:22 PM
To: McKaughan, Colleen; Lee, Anita
Subject: RE: I am attaching the list of the Jan NGS Calls to Tribes

Colleen – Do you know if Anita or I should plan to attend any of the calls?

Ann Lyons
Office of Regional Counsel
U.S.E.P.A.
75 Hawthorne Steet
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-972-3883
lyons.ann@epa.gov

From: McKaughan, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Lee, Anita; Lyons, Ann
Subject: FW: I am attaching the list of the Jan NGS Calls to Tribes

Pam resent the chart we used for the proposal. I will draft some talking points for your review tomorrow morning.

From: Overman, Pamela
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:15 PM
To: McKaughan, Colleen
Subject: RE:I am attaching the list of the Jan NGS Calls to Tribes

---

From: McKaughan, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:11 PM
To: Overman, Pamela
Subject: RE: Might this be the purpose of the call?

We want to talk to Navajo about our proposed action on the Technical Work Group agreement. We have extended the public comment period on the NGS BART determination to January 6, 2014.

From: Overman, Pamela
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:09 PM

To: McKaughan, Colleen
Subject: RE: Might this be the purpose of the call?

Are we extending the comment period?
What should I say is the purpose of the call?

From: McKaughan, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:08 PM
To: Overman, Pamela
Subject: RE: Might this be the purpose of the call?

Yes, it is.

From: Overman, Pamela
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:07 PM
To: McKaughan, Colleen
Subject: FW: Might this be the purpose of the call?

Eugenia asked if this was the purpose of the call.

From: Eugenia Quintana [mailto:eugeniaquintana@navajo-nsn.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:05 PM
To: Overman, Pamela
Subject: Might this be the purpose of the call?

Pam here is the article:

Republic Washington Bureau

Mon Sep 23, 2013 4:50 PM

WASHINGTON -- The new head of the Environmental Protection Agency said Monday she is encouraged by an alternative plan to cut emissions at the Navajo Generating Station, the northern Arizona power plant critical to the state's economy.

The plan — advanced by the Salt River Project and its partners in the coal-fired plant near Page — countered the EPA's proposed order that the plant install nitrogen oxide-reducing catalytic converters to reduce haze that clouds visitors' views of the Grand Canyon and other national parks. The plant's owners have estimated the cost at $500 million to $1 billion.

SRP and its partners instead proposed that one of the plant's three units be shut down by 2020 while pollution-control equipment is installed at the two remaining units by 2030.

"We consider it a significant step forward," said EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, who succeeded former Administrator Lisa Jackson in July.

The EPA will issue a supplemental proposal for the Navajo Generating Station that reflects the plan, McCarthy said.

The 2,250-megawatt Navajo Generating Station, the largest coal-fired plant in the West, is one of the nation's largest producers of the nitrogen oxide pollution that causes smog and acid rain, EPA officials say.

But the 29-year-old plant, located on the Navajo Reservation, also is crucial to Arizona's economy. It provides more than 90 percent of the energy used by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District to pump water from the Colorado River to homes, farms and businesses throughout the state.

The plan to close one of the plant's units was submitted in July by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Gila River Indian Community, the Navajo Nation, Salt River Project (on behalf of itself and the other plant owners), the U.S. Department of the Interior and Western Resource Advocates.

"If you read the proposal we put out, it was an open invitation to stakeholders to come up with an alternative," McCarthy said.

McCarthy said one of her main goals as EPA administrator is to reduce the carbon emissions that cause climate change. Coal-fired power plants are a major source of those emissions.

The EPA last week announced regulations that will limit emissions from new coal-fired and natural-gas plants. To meet the standards, new plants would have to install cutting-edge technology that owners say is costly and untested.

Those new regulations are considered to be a prelude to a much bigger plan next year to reduce emissions at existing power plants. President Barack Obama has directed the EPA to propose new standards for existing plants by June and finalize them in 2015.

Unlike new plants, existing coal-fired plants won't be required to install equipment to capture and store the carbon dioxide they emit, McCarthy said. Instead, the agency will issue guidelines for states that allow existing plants more flexibility in how to reduce their emissions, she said.

The coal industry has accused the EPA of waging a war on coal.

"EPA regulations have already contributed to shutting down coal plants in 33 states," said Mike Duncan, president and CEO of the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity. "Unfortunately, it looks like the administration also wants to make sure no new coal plants are ever built again in the United States."

McCarthy said Monday the new standards are designed to give the coal industry "a path forward" to a cleaner, more modern future that attracts investors.

"We know coal isn't the fuel of choice right now," she said. But cleaner technology could change that, she said.

Asked about the potential of a government shutdown if Congress cannot pass a spending bill by the end of the month, McCarthy said she still hopes a shutdown can be avoided but is making contingency plans in case it happens.

“The vast majority of (EPA) employees will not be working (if the shutdown happens),” McCarthy said.

There would be limited exceptions. McCarthy said she would stay on the job, along with a core group of people who can respond to emergencies. EPA teams respond to major oil spills, chemical leaks and releases of biological and radiological material.