To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Massey, Matt[Massey.Matt@epa.gov]; Walsh, Patrick[Walsh.Patrick@epa.gov]
Cc: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Fri 6/12/2015 2:11:46 PM
Subject: RE: SSC in the Steam Electric ELG BCA

My apologies, I missed the question below yesterday about SCC in 2013$. I will pull them out and send in a few minutes.

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 3:34 PM
To: Massey, Matt; Walsh, Patrick
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: SSC in the Steam Electric ELG BCA

Hi Matt and Patrick,

Here are my suggestions for revising the SCC section to make it consistent with the discussion we are using in other rules in the pipeline (e.g., Landfills, O&G, 111). I have flagged the tables that still need to be updated to reflect the SCC correction. I have to leave soon but should be able to send you the corrected estimates tomorrow – unless, Kate, do you have it easily at hand? (They need them in 2013$).

Ex 5

Alex and Kate – also please chime in if you notice anything I missed.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Massey, Matt
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:07 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Walsh, Patrick
Subject: SSC in the Steam Electric ELG BCA

Hi Alex and Elizabeth,

Be careful what you ask for! The SSC stuff starts in section 7.1.3 on page 7-8 (or page 86 of the word file). Please let us know if you guys spot any problem or things that need changing.

Matt

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Tue 7/21/2015 1:31:37 PM
Subject: RE: Full Committee Oversight Hearing on "An Analysis of the Obama Administration's Social Cost of Carbon" - House Committee on Natural Resources

I don't blame them.

--
Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: Full Committee Oversight Hearing on "An Analysis of the Obama Administration's Social Cost of Carbon" - House Committee on Natural Resources

:) Other people they asked said no.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 21, 2015, at 9:12 AM, "Marten, Alex" <Marten.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> Thanks Brett.
>
> It's good to see they are taking this so seriously that they recruited truly qualified experts on climate change economics and the SCC to testify.
>
> --
> Alex L. Marten
> phone: (202) 566-2301
> email: marten.alex@epa.gov
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Snyder, Brett
> Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 9:02 AM
> To: Marten, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth; Brett Cease; Griffiths, Charles; Moore, Chris; Wolverton, Ann
> Cc: Bowen, Jennifer; McGartland, Al
> Subject: Full Committee Oversight Hearing on "An Analysis of the Obama Administration's Social Cost of Carbon" - House Committee on Natural Resources
>
> FYI
>
> Speakers at hearing announced
>
> http://naturalresources.house.gov/calendar/eventsingle.aspx?EventID=399064
>
>
> Brett Snyder
> USEPA, NCEE
> Via mobile device

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Macpherson, Alex
Sent: Mon 7/20/2015 2:19:09 PM
Subject: RE: SCC in short tons?

Hi Kate

I can cover climate benefits for the communications staff briefing.

Ex 5

Alex

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:35 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:14 AM
To: Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 9:06 AM, "Macpherson, Alex" <Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:06 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Macpherson, Alex; Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 9:03 AM, "Shouse, Kate" <Shouse.Kate@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:02 AM
To: Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 8:50 AM, "Macpherson, Alex" <Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 8:47 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Macpherson, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Looping in Alex. He has probably been brought up to speed already on this ask, but just in case.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

On Jul 20, 2015, at 7:32 AM, Kopits, Elizabeth <Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 7:28 AM, "Shouse, Kate" <Shouse.Kate@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Macpherson, Alex[Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Mon 7/20/2015 1:48:02 PM
Subject: RE: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:39 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Macpherson, Alex; Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Otherwise proceed as needed.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 9:34 AM, "Shouse, Kate" <Shouse.Kate@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:14 AM
To: Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex

Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 9:06 AM, "Macpherson, Alex" <Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:06 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Macpherson, Alex; Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 9:03 AM, "Shouse, Kate" <Shouse.Kate@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:02 AM
To: Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 8:50 AM, "Macpherson, Alex" <Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 8:47 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Macpherson, Alex
Subject: Re: SCC in short tons?

Ex 5

Looping in Alex. He has probably been brought up to speed already on this ask, but just in case.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

On Jul 20, 2015, at 7:32 AM, Kopits, Elizabeth <Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 7:28 AM, "Shouse, Kate"
<Shouse.Kate@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex 5

Sent from my iPhone

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wed 7/1/2015 7:43:18 PM
Subject: RE: FYI - OMB will be releasing the Social cost of carbon (SCC) response to public comments tomorrow

Thanks, Elizabeth, this is all really helpful.

On the HD2 memo: OTAQ has a PDF copy of the memo and they will docket it. The docket doesn't open to the public until the day the rule hits the Federal Register, which they just heard is July 13th.

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: FYI - OMB will be releasing the Social cost of carbon (SCC) response to public comments tomorrow

Fyi -

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Reynolds, Thomas; Purchia, Liz; Millett, John
Cc: Beauvais, Joel; McGartland, Al; Kime, Robin
Subject: FYI - OMB will be releasing the Social cost of carbon (SCC) response to public comments tomorrow

Dear Tom, Liz, and John,

Per Joel's suggestion, I am writing to let you know that OMB plans to release a response to public comments (RTC) received through the recent OMB solicitation for comment on the Interagency working group's Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) estimates used by EPA and other Federal agencies in regulatory benefit-cost analysis. The response will be announced via an OMB blog post. The RTC and minor corrections to the SCC technical support document (TSD)

will also be posted on OMB's website tomorrow. (There will also be a FR notice announcing the availability of the response and revised TSD, but this will likely lag a week or two.)

OMB and CEA will likely handle all comms inquiries, but we have developed our own desk statements and Q&As on this effort. I have sent these to both OMB and CEA staff as well in case it is helpful to them.

Attached are:

- Desk statements and Q&A on the RTC, revised TSD, and announcement of a forthcoming National Academy of Sciences' expert review.

- Provisional desk statement and Q&A on valuing non-CO2 GHGs in RIAs. This is likely less relevant for tomorrow, but after tomorrow's OMB posting, OTAQ will be adding a memo to the proposed Phase 2 Heavy Duty vehicle rule docket that updates the benefit numbers for that rule to reflect the minor SCC revisions mentioned above. Ex 5

Ex 5

- the final version of the blog post for your convenience.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Kopits, Ph.D.

National Center for Environmental Economics

Office of Policy, US EPA

1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, MC 1809T

Washington, DC 20460

(202) 566-2299

To: Harvey, Alecia[Harvey.Alecia@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thur 5/7/2015 2:54:15 PM
Subject: RE: Can you ...

Ex 5

From: Harvey, Alecia
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 10:42 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: Can you ...

Thanks

Ex 5

Thanks again!

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 9:50 AM
To: Harvey, Alecia; Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: Can you ...

HI Alecia,

Here you go! Let me know if you need more/less. I am now working on the SOW.

Ex 5

something more specific?

(By the way my office phone still doesn't work so if you want to talk feel free to call my cell: Personal cell/email

Thanks!

Elizabeth

Ex 5

Ex 5

From: Harvey, Alecia
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Subject: Can you ...
Importance: High

Give me the below information as soon as you get it even if I get a million emails from you:

Project title:

Project description:

Describe the proposed project's objectives and how the IA will accomplish them. The objectives must be consistent with the statutory authority for the agreement. If the funded work is part of a larger project, the description of the project should be clear as to which parts of the work will be funded by the IA and which will not:

Brief description of why this IA alternative was selected:

Description of why the particular agency was selected:

I may have more questions later. Thanks

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thur 3/5/2015 3:12:11 AM
Subject: methane discussions
RIA draft (03 04 15) v3.docx
preamble methane excerpt (ks)-mcs.docx

Hi, Alex. I've attached two SC-CH4 sections: (1) landfills preamble section ("preamble methane excerpt..." and (2) oil and gas RIA ("RIA draft (03 04 15) v3"). Both sections closely mirror the oil and gas preamble section that you reviewed last week. The oil and gas RIA shows redline where changes were made. Comments most welcome.

Also, I used the latest emission estimates from Jameel [redacted] **Non-Responsive**
Non-Responsive

thanks,
Kate

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Gilbreath, Jan
Sent: Tue 4/7/2015 4:08:50 PM
Subject: FW: OAR FAR: Oil & Natural Gas Sector (SAN 5719.1)
Oil_Gas 2nd DRAFT for WG NSPS-2 Preamble 04-06-15.docx
oil_natural_gas_proposal_nsps_ria_040615_FAR_Draft.docx
Oil&GasNSPS FAR Pro Action Memo 4-6-15.docx
ONG NSPS_2 Subpart OOOO RLSO rule text 04-06-15.docx
FAR memo oil and gas.pdf

From: Rush, Alan
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 6:05 PM
To: Durkee, Stanley; Mia, Marcia; Branning, Amy; Gilbreath, Jan; Vyas, Himanshu; Hyde, Tinka; Lawrence, Rob; Beeler, Cindy; Moore, Bruce; Owens, Nicole; Adams, Darryl
Cc: Eck, Janet; Henigin, Mary; Dougherty, Joseph-J; Farrar, Wanda; Eagles, Tom; Bartlett, Keith; Simons, Andrew; Balserak, Paul; Fegley, Robert; Appleby, Michael; Jencius, Morgan; Garcia, David; Moore, Sonya; OP ADP Calendar; Ali, Mustafa; Marks, Teresa; Knapp, Kristien
Subject: RE: OAR FAR: Oil & Natural Gas Sector (SAN 5719.1)

I'm very sorry if you did not receive these attachments in the calendar invitation, but I blame Outlook. Anyway, here are the files for the final agency review on April 21.

Alan Rush

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Rush, Alan
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 5:51 PM
To: Durkee, Stanley; Mia, Marcia; Branning, Amy; Gilbreath, Jan; Vyas, Himanshu; Hyde, Tinka; Lawrence, Rob; Beeler, Cindy; Moore, Bruce; Owens, Nicole; Adams, Darryl
Cc: Eck, Janet; Henigin, Mary; Dougherty, Joseph-J; Farrar, Wanda; Eagles, Tom; Bartlett, Keith; Simons, Andrew; Balserak, Paul; Fegley, Robert; Appleby, Michael; Jencius, Morgan; Garcia, David; Moore, Sonya; OP ADP Calendar; Ali, Mustafa; Marks, Teresa; Knapp, Kristien
Subject: OAR FAR: Oil & Natural Gas Sector (SAN 5719.1)
When: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 3:00 PM-3:30 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: WJC-N Room 6530 call in number Conference code

The Final Agency Review meeting on SAN 5719.1, proposed rule for the Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New and Modified Sources is scheduled for April 21, 2015, at 3:00 pm, Room 6530 of the William Jefferson Clinton North Building, call-in
Conference code

The Final Agency Review package is attached. The final rule for the Oil and Natural Gas

Sector: Emission Standards for New and Modified Sources is being developed as a Tier 1 project under the EPA's regulatory development process. Final Agency Review is the final point for internal agency concurrence for the attached package.

<< File: FAR memo oil and gas.pdf >> << File: Oil Gas 2nd DRAFT for WG NSPS-2 Preamble 04-06-15.docx >> << File: oil_natural_gas_proposal_nsps_ria_040615_FAR_Draft.docx >> << File: Oil&GasNSPS FAR Pro Action Memo 4-6-15.docx >> << File: ONG NSPS_2 Subpart OOOO RLSO rule text 04-06-15.docx >>

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wed 3/11/2015 3:30:39 PM
Subject: Re: response to EPW et al letter?

Ex 6 - Other feel free to email jim, i dont want to hold it up

---

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:23 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: response to EPW et al letter?

I was just looking at the spreadsheet of comments and the latest version I have dated 05/05/14 has 141 unique letters received and 141 unique commenters. Interesting coincidence.

I am happy if you want to reply with that information.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:21 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: response to EPW et al letter?

I think that makes most sense for you to wait, otherwise I think you'll be spending time making the same edits/comments. Will send you the updated one once I can do so.

Just saw Jim's email and was starting to respond (copied below) - do you want to add anything? I have the comment file at home and can tally the number of unique letters but can't guarantee it within the next couple of hours (Ex 6 - Other up soon).

"Hi, Jim. Yes, the 36,000 number came from a letter writing campaign from some environmental organizations. We recently verified that number; Margo Schwab sent me a PDF file that contained all of the names. I am home with Ex 6 - Other able to check that file again in the office tomorrow. Please let me know if you need that information sooner, though.

I don't know the number of unique comment letters (versus commenters) offhand but will take a look and find that number (that info is contained in our spreadsheet of comments). "

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:19 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: response to EPW et al letter?

Sorry to hear that.

From your previous email on the landfill preamble it sounded like you might be porting over my comments from the O&G preamble but hadn't gotten to that yet. If my understanding is correct on that point, should I just wait to look at it?

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 11:12 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: Re: response to EPW et al letter?

Thanks. I am at home today with Ex 6 - Other
Please give me a call at Ex 6 - Other if anything comes up today.

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 4:00 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: response to EPW et al letter?

No I haven't. Reached out to EOP this morning but haven't heard back.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 3:00 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: response to EPW et al letter?

Saw that Alex Barron recommended coordination with OMB in responding to the Senators' SCC letter; have you heard anything about plans to respond?

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Fawcett, Allen[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]; Ragnauth, Shaun[Ragnauth.Shaun@epa.gov]
From: Sarofim, Marcus
Sent: Thur 2/26/2015 6:53:52 PM
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble
preamble scm section v4 - mcs alm ks mcs.docx

Minor edits to last paragraph. I can talk at 3 but I'm not sure you need me,

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
WJC East 4410M
Environmental Scientist
Climate Science & Impacts Branch

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 1:17 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Sarofim, Marcus; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

I could talk at 3.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 1:16 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Thanks, Alex and Marcus, good comments all around. I've responded to some comments in the attached and made additional edits. Perhaps we can talk over the phone this afternoon? My afternoon calendar looks good starting at 2 pm so let me know when you'll have a few minutes or if it will be easier to sort out over email.

Ex 5

Thanks,
Kate

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 6:57 PM
To: Sarofim, Marcus; Shouse, Kate; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

I have included comments (on top of Marcus') in the attached. Ex 5

Ex 5

you all could take a look and potentially have another go at what is there. If we could iterate on that tomorrow I can ping Alex B. before the weekend for his thoughts, Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Ex 5

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Sarofim, Marcus
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 4:22 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Hi Kate,

I've made some edits, ranging from the straightforward (u Ex 5 to the editorial (e.g. Ex 5, and then one Ex 5 Ex 5 added to the end discussing Ex 5 which I would welcome feedback on,

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
WJC East 4410M
Environmental Scientist
Climate Science & Impacts Branch

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:22 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Cc: Shouse, Kate
Subject: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Hi, everyone. Please find attached a first draft of the social cost of methane section for the oil and gas preamble. Any comments you have will be most welcome, ideally by COB Thursday, or by 10 am on Friday. I will consolidate the comments and add the text to the package, which is destined for the OAR front office on Monday. If you don't have time to review and comment this week, I will be able to add comments to the next iteration (package to FAR on March 9th).

I expect to use very similar language in the landfills preamble, so your comments here will carry over. Landfills is about a week or so behind oil and gas (in terms of internal

package dates) so I won't submit anything to landfills until after we've resolved comments on this oil and gas section. There is an RIA for the oil and gas package but no emissions estimates yet.

Allen, please let me know if I should route this to Paul and when (before or after your review).

Marcus, this includes the excerpt on methane impacts. It looks like a placeholder, language copied over from the 2012 oil and gas NSPS. Not sure if you're working directly in the Sharepoint file, just let me know what's easier for you.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wed 2/25/2015 4:21:14 PM
Subject: one more comment on the SCM section
preamble scm section v4.docx

Hi, Alex. I ran through the SCM draft quickly and realized that I did not include any language about the OMB RTC or plans for the NAS panel. Perhaps we can put a placeholder in this draft and be ready to fill it in if the RTC/NAS plans are published before we send the oil and gas package to OMB. If they are not published before submission to OMB, I'll delete the placeholder. I flagged one spot in the attached where it might go (see pg 3). If you've already started working in the file I sent yesterday, please keep using that. I made a few editorial corrections in redline to the attached but I don't think they change the meaning of the text.

Thanks,
Kate

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:22 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Cc: Shouse, Kate
Subject: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Hi, everyone. Please find attached a first draft of the social cost of methane section for the oil and gas preamble. Any comments you have will be most welcome, ideally by COB Thursday, or by 10 am on Friday. I will consolidate the comments and add the text to the package, which is destined for the OAR front office on Monday. If you don't have time to review and comment this week, I will be able to add comments to the next iteration (package to FAR on March 9th).

I expect to use very similar language in the landfills preamble, so your comments here will carry over. Landfills is about a week or so behind oil and gas (in terms of internal package dates) so I won't submit anything to landfills until after we've resolved comments on this oil and gas section. There is an RIA for the oil and gas package but no emissions estimates yet.

Allen, please let me know if I should route this to Paul and when (before or after your review).

Marcus, this includes the excerpt on methane impacts. It looks like a placeholder, language copied over from the 2012 oil and gas NSPS. Not sure if you're working directly in the Sharepoint file, just let me know what's easier for you.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Tue 7/21/2015 3:23:10 PM
Subject: RE: EPRI comments on costs and ben in CPP

oh yeah, that's right.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 11:06 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: EPRI comments on costs and ben in CPP

Thanks, Alex, one more note: Regarding the last point on guidance about how to apply the

Ex 5

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 1:05 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Eschmann, Erich; Adamantiades, Mikhail
Subject: Re: EPRI comments on costs and ben in CPP

Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

--

Alex Marten

marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 3:30 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Eschmann, Erich; Adamantiades, Mikhail
Subject: Fwd: EPRI comments on costs and ben in CPP

Ex 5

Ex 5

EPRI comment:

One comment stated that there are inconsistencies in the RIA's cost-benefit comparisons of estimated CO2 benefits and compliance costs and recommended that EPA correct them for proper comparison of benefits and costs:

- "The RIA compares levelized (or annualized) compliance costs to annual CO2 benefits. This is an inconsistent comparison with no practical meaning. The proper comparison is a comparison of the net present value streams of fixed and variable compliance costs and estimated benefits (both for CO2 and air pollution reductions)."
- "The proposed rule's base case is inconsistent with the socioeconomic/emissions scenarios used in the SCC calculations. Specifically, the U.S. CO2 emissions, energy system, and economic condition underlying the estimated CO2 reductions and compliance costs are inconsistent with the socioeconomic and emissions futures underlying the USG SCC estimates used to value the proposed rules CO2 reduction benefits. The SCC estimates are computed using five alternative global socioeconomic and GHG emissions futures designed to span a range of possible global futures, with each future considered equally likely. Compliance costs and CO2 reductions in the RIA, on the other hand, assume a single, U.S. power sector projection (based on the AEO 2013 Reference Case). This is an issue because the underlying USG modeling shows that SCC values vary across socioeconomic and emissions assumptions (USG, 2014). Therefore, one would want the same reference case assumptions for the SCC, CO2 reductions, and compliance costs, or an argument for why it is unnecessary."
- The commenter found that when comparing the USG SCC and AEO2013 Reference Case socioeconomic and emissions projections, "the AEO2013 projections do not compare well with any of the USG SCC input scenarios, with lower projected U.S. energy sector CO2 emissions and higher GDP that are based on much lower assumptions regarding the emissions and energy intensity of output (CO2/GDP and Btu/GDP respectively)".
- The commenter also stated that "USG SCC technical documentation recommends using all four of the USG time profiles of SCC values. The four have meaningful differences in discounting and what they represent probabilistically. However, there is no USG guidance on how agencies should apply the different SCC values jointly and consistently in rulemaking."

To: Evans, DavidA[Evans.DavidA@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
Cc: Risley, David[Risley.David@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Fri 5/8/2015 2:59:14 PM
Subject: RE: 111b RIA Status

Kate, maybe next week we can develop some brief text on the RTC that can then later be inserted into the plethora of packages that will be at OMB by the end of the month.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Evans, DavidA
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 10:56 AM
To: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex
Cc: Risley, David
Subject: RE: 111b RIA Status

Edit to chapter 1 looks good to me. Thanks! David, should complementary text about Non-Responsive Non-Responsive be included in the FN?

I suspect ch 5 comment is to Alex.

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 10:49 AM
To: Marten, Alex; Evans, DavidA
Cc: Risley, David
Subject: FW: 111b RIA Status

FYI:

Ch 1, I chimed in on Dave Evan's benefits comment

Ch 3, I removed the placeholders for SCC updates (pending OMB RTC release) and made notes for myself so that I remember what to update. Ex 5

Ex 5

Ch 5, Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

From: CurryBrown, Amanda
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 6:45 PM
To: Deck, Leland; Shouse, Kate; Risley, David; Hutson, Nick; Evans, DavidA; Marten, Alex; Fellner, Christian; Johnson, Mary; Culligan, Kevin; Macpherson, Alex; Langdon, Robin; Weatherhead, Darryl; Hubbell, Bryan; Chappell, Linda; Keaveny, Brian; Stenhouse, Jeb; Silverman, Steven
Subject: 111b RIA Status

Hi All,

I've gone through the document and accepted most of the changes and responded to the comments I was able to. Below is a summary of what remains in each chapter, based on the edits received as of 6:30 Thursday night… complete with assignments ☺ As a reminder on process – tomorrow morning Leland is going to incorporate revised figures in Ch. 4 and will notify Brian when this is complete. At that time, Brian will lock Ch. 4 for editing and incorporate it into the rest of the document. After that, everyone can continue to work until "pens down" for OMB delivery. This will likely be on Monday – Linda will let you know the exact timing.

One favor – if you make additional comments that will require coordination or input from others

to address, please flag these for the group via email so everyone is aware as early as possible. Hopefully that will help avoid some of the last minute scramble. To the extent that you can make line edits, that's even better.

As always, thanks for all of the hard work on this one!

Amanda

Executive Summary

Dave/Alex – close out remaining comments in consultation with relevant team members

Ch. 1

Dave/Alex – close out remaining comments as above

Kate/David – weigh in on comments re: benefits

Ch. 2

Leland – address comment from Mark DeFigueiredo + missing fn and incomplete sentence I flagged

Ch. 3

Kate/Alex – close out remaining comments if possible or note things that may needed to be added later so we don't forget when a clean version is created

Ch. 4

Leland – incorporate remaining edits into chapter draft on sharepoint

Brian – coordinate with Leland when edits are incorporated in chapter draft on sharepoint and add chapter into combined document

Ch. 5

Dave/Alex – close out remaining comments as above

Kate/David – weigh in on comments re: benefits

Kate/David – double check flagged LCOE information when Ch. 4 is finalized

Ch. 6

Team – Non-Responsive Nick/Christian/Dave/Alex should definitely take a look – anyone else who has thoughts is welcome to weigh in!

Ch. 7

Brian – update with revised preamble EO language

Amanda Curry Brown

Health and Environmental Impacts Division

U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

919.541.3808

CurryBrown.Amanda@epa.gov

To: Macpherson, Alex[Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Evans, DavidA[Evans.DavidA@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Thur 5/7/2015 9:14:01 PM
Subject: RE: OP comments on 111d preamble

I like the idea of adding the non-monitized line item to the table to better convey that we don't think we have fully monetized climate benefits.

In terms of the potential new language, I think it needs a couple tweaks for context and accuracy. If I had been reading our (d) preamble comments this morning instead of the (b) RIA I would have edited it to something like this:

In addition, due to current data and modeling limitations, our estimates of the benefits from reducing CO2 emissions do not include important impacts like ocean acidification or potential tipping points in natural or managed ecosystems.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Macpherson, Alex
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 4:52 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex; Evans, DavidA
Subject: OP comments on 111d preamble

OK, working on comments from OP on the FAR Preamble. Couple of questions:

Kate and Alex: CLIMATE BENEFITS

Alex Barron wants to list "non-monetized climate benefits" in the Net Benefit Tables. Seems fine to me.

Alex B also has the comment:

We should have an OP OAR conversation on this but it seems prudent in the RIA and the preamble to note that SCC is missing or undercounts many climate impacts. Some text in the paragraph following this table could also be added.

And the suggestion is the underlined parts:

Ex 5

Are we ok with this. I don't see any big issues but maybe y'all want to work on the underlined language? Also, does the current SCC discussion in RIA already address the 'underestimate' issue?

Dave

Your EMPLOYMENT: Non-Responsive
suggest:

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Sarofim, Marcus[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov]
Cc: CurryBrown, Amanda[CurryBrown.amanda@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Fri 5/1/2015 8:32:04 PM
Subject: RE: 111(b): edits to CH 3 RIA

Kate, I'm good with the redline edits. I just fixed a typo or two. I also left a comment agreeing with David R's comment that Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

I am OK with leaving the bulk of the climate impacts discussion in the preamble as I think the two documents should be complements and leverage cross references over duplication where appropriate. However, I think it would be awkward for the chapter to dive right into the SCC discussion. Therefore, I think that at least a short intro to climate impacts that then references the preamble would be nice to have. But Amanda may have a better sense of the best approach given her vision for the RIA.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 4:13 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: CurryBrown, Amanda
Subject: FW: 111(b): edits to CH 3 RIA

Just wanted to check in on 111(b) Ch 3. Alex, are you okay with the redline edits or were you planning to take a look again? We closed out on the Non-Responsive Non-Responsive but I wasn't sure if you wanted to read through it again.

I think the other outstanding question is in the Non-Responsive
Non-Responsive
Non-Responsive or provide a brief summary per Alex's suggestion?

Thanks,
Kate

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2015 12:51 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Cc: Sarofim, Marcus; CurryBrown, Amanda; Risley, David
Subject: 111(b): edits to CH 3 RIA

Thanks, Alex, for the comments on the 111(b) Ch 3 RIA. I think the re-order works well. Really good catch on the sentence about public comments since 2006 (pg 13). I've provided a detailed response in the comment box and minor edit to the sentence. In short, the sentence refers to "other agencies" and I think 2006 was meant to refer to NHTSA's CAFÉ rule. I also updated the paragraph about limitations to be more consistent with OMB RTC and reference AR5 (see redline on pg 13). Let me know what you think of those edits.

Amanda, I'll remove redline once I've closed out with Alex on that section.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Evans, DavidA[Evans.DavidA@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Mon 4/27/2015 7:42:48 PM
Subject: RE: FYI, in current draft - option value
2015 04 27 cost of nsps vs partial ccs v2.docx

Here is my current thinking, not sure if it useful for the preamble or RIA or maybe nothing...

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Evans, DavidA
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 3:38 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: FYI, in current draft - option value

Non-Responsive

Sadly, chapter 5 is nowhere near done.

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Evans, DavidA
Subject: RE: FYI, in current draft - option value

Yeah that section was Non-Responsive

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Evans, DavidA
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: FYI, in current draft - option value

I'm not sure what the heck Non-Responsive is.

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Ex 5

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Macpherson, Alex[Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov]; Sarofim, Marcus[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov]
Cc: Alsalam, Jameel[Alsalam.Jameel@epa.gov]; Moore, Bruce[Moore.Bruce@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Mon 4/13/2015 8:23:15 PM
Subject: RE: any progress on CO2 disbenefit bullet point?
alvarez et al - 2012 - greater focus needed on methane leakage from natural gas infrastructure.pdf
marshal and kelly - 2010 - the time value of carbon and carbon storage.pdf

Just as an FYI. Two potentially interesting papers.

Marshal and Kelly speak to this issue directly. But I think the Alvarez et al. assessment Ex 5

Ex 5

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 4:07 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Macpherson, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: Alsalam, Jameel; Moore, Bruce
Subject: RE: any progress on CO2 disbenefit bullet point?

Thanks, Alex Marten, I think these are helpful edits. Alex Macpherson, is this sufficient for you to share with OAQPS or do you need to discuss further with this small group?

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 3:22 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Macpherson, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: Alsalam, Jameel; Moore, Bruce
Subject: RE: any progress on CO2 disbenefit bullet point?

The attached has a few suggestions for the draft language. I am one wondering if we should include per ton numbers to elicit more informed comments? Tried something on in the attached to see how it feels.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 3:21 PM
To: Macpherson, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: Marten, Alex; Alsalam, Jameel; Moore, Bruce
Subject: RE: any progress on CO2 disbenefit bullet point?

Hi, Alex. Please see attached for brief write-up on proposed path forward; it presents three options plus text that we can use in the rulemaking documents. Rona and Allen (management for Marcus and me) are good with the attached document; it also reflects input from Alex Marten. We have not specified (1) where this text should (i.e., preamble and/or RIA) and (2) have not included an explicit request for comment.

Perhaps we can address those questions after OAQPS has had a chance to review.

Thanks,
Kate

From: Macpherson, Alex
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:13 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: Marten, Alex; Alsalam, Jameel; Moore, Bruce

Subject: any progress on CO2 disbenefit bullet point?

Kate, Marcus

We'll need to get this as resolved as possible this week. If you can share the quick writeup of our proposed path forward, that would be great. Thanks

Alex

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
Bcc: Ex 6 - Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Mon 4/13/2015 4:33:10 PM
Subject: RE: NHTSA's alternative language

Thanks for checking in, but I will continue to defer to you on this issue.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 12:51 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: FW: NHTSA's alternative language

Hi, Alex. FYI, I know you were ambivalent about the options before, just wanted to give you a heads up and confirm that you remain ambivalent. This is for the heavy duty vehicle rule. Thanks.

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 12:44 PM
To: Allen (fawcett.allen@epa.gov)
Subject: NHTSA's alternative language

Hi, Allen. The SCC footnote is the last Ex 5

Ex 5

know if you have any concerns/preferences – I've summarized the options below. Also, in

responding to NHTSA with our preference, I'd like to include something like the reasoning I give below so Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

Current footnote text:

Ex 5

1. Revised footnote text:

Ex 5

2. Revise P09K introductory text as follows and revise the footnote.

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Ex 5

Non-Responsive

Ex 5

To: Sarofim, Marcus[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Fawcett, Allen[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]; Ragnauth, Shaun[Ragnauth.Shaun@epa.gov]
Bcc: Alex Marten
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Wed 2/25/2015 11:56:59 PM
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble
2015 02 24 preamble scm section v4 - mcs alm.docx

I have included comments (on top of Marcus') in the attached. My biggest concern at this point is the paragraph summarizing the review. I really like what was there, but Ex 5 It would be great if you all could take a look and potentially have another go at what is there. If we could iterate on that tomorrow I can ping Alex B. before the weekend for his thoughts, Ex 5
Ex 5

We should also think about how the structure of that discussion might change given the publication of the RTC and future plans. Or at least how we will integrate that.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Sarofim, Marcus
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 4:22 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Subject: RE: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Hi Kate,

I've made some edits, ranging from the straightforward (updating the science to reflect AR5), to the editorial (e.g. Ex 5
Ex 5

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
WJC East 4410M
Environmental Scientist
Climate Science & Impacts Branch

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:22 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Sarofim, Marcus; Fawcett, Allen; Ragnauth, Shaun
Cc: Shouse, Kate
Subject: draft SCM text for oil and gas preamble

Hi, everyone. Please find attached a first draft of the social cost of methane section for the oil and gas preamble. Any comments you have will be most welcome, ideally by COB Thursday, or by 10 am on Friday. I will consolidate the comments and add the text to the package, which is destined for the OAR front office on Monday. If you don't have time to review and comment this week, I will be able to add comments to the next iteration (package to FAR on March 9th).

I expect to use very similar language in the landfills preamble, so your comments here will carry over. Landfills is about a week or so behind oil and gas (in terms of internal package dates) so I won't submit anything to landfills until after we've resolved comments on this oil and gas section. There is an RIA for the oil and gas package but no emissions estimates yet.

Allen, please let me know if I should route this to Paul and when (before or after your review).

Marcus, this includes the excerpt on methane impacts. It looks like a placeholder, language copied over from the 2012 oil and gas NSPS. Not sure if you're working directly in the Sharepoint file, just let me know what's easier for you.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Newbold, Steve[Newbold.Steve@epa.gov]
From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Mon 6/29/2015 3:56:41 PM
Subject: RE: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee
2015 06 29 potential committee suggestions - alm.docx

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2015 3:46 PM
To: Marten, Alex
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Wolverton, Ann; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: Re: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Hi All,

Here's a revised version of the recommendation list. I think it includes everyone's input so far, but please let me know if I missed anyone. The folks on DOE's list that are not included in ours are on p. 2, along with some reactions on why they shouldn't be included. I haven't had a chance to look up all of them though.

Let me know what you think or feel free to edit directly. I know there are a number of different ways to organize this, but hopefully we can get to something we all are ok with and send to Josh by early next week.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 12:38 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Wolverton, Ann; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: RE: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Attached is DOE's list of suggestions. They have some good suggestions, and some others are great researchers but I'm just not sure why they would be good fits for this charge.

It sounds like the goal is to come up with a single USG list to send to NAS. We want to be helpful, but do we want to limit the list a bit to emphasize who we think would be really good?

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 9:28 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Cc: Shouse, Kate; Wolverton, Ann; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: Re: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Thanks to all for the very helpful input!! Once I get my computer back(!) I will compile and recirculate.

Elizabeth

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 24, 2015, at 5:51 PM, "Marten, Alex" <Marten.Alex@epa.gov> wrote:

a few more suggestions in the attached, but didn't get as far as I wanted. to be honest i am a little burned out when it comes to coming up with names for workshops, panels, committees, etc.

Ex 5

Ex 5

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 4:12 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Wolverton, Ann
Cc: Marten, Alex; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: RE: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Regarding Ann's question about whether any CIRA contributors would be a good fit: I think the those with most relevant expertise have already been named (the MIT and PNNL

Ex 5

What about Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, one of the two authors on the ENVISAGE paper? Looks like he's currently the director of GTAP, https://ag.purdue.edu/agecon/Pages/Profile.aspx?strAlias=vandermd&intDirDeptID=4 . I've never spoken with him but he seems to be active in the IAMC and in the CGE world.

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 2:38 PM
To: Wolverton, Ann
Cc: Marten, Alex; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; Shouse, Kate; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Thanks, Ann. This is really helpful.

From: Wolverton, Ann
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 1:46 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Marten, Alex; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; Shouse, Kate; McGartland, Al; Fawcett, Allen
Subject: Re: Start on list of potential candidates for NAS SCC committee

Ex 5

I like the idea of adding a couple more broad thinkers like Ex 5 Kolstad to the panel.

Ex 5

Is there anyone from the CIRA project that might be a good fit?

Is there anyone from the CGE world making a serious effort to incorporate climate benefits that we could add? Again, it could broaden the perspective a bit.

Ann

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 23, 2015, at 12:47 PM, Kopits, Elizabeth <Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi all,

I have started to pull together some names we could potentially forward to the NAS for consideration. See attached list and notes. Please let me know what you think, including views on whether any should be deleted or added. Also, please let me know if you have a preference for how we organize/transmit our suggestions, e.g.:

- Suggest a specific breakdown by topic - e.g., we recommend at least(or no more than?) X IAM modelers (e.g., Nordhaus, …), X economists with expertise in discounting (e.g., Ken Arrow, …), at least X economists with expertise in each of the following damage categories (e.g., agriculture (Mendelsohn, Schlenker, …), …)), at least X climate scientists including expertise in climate sensitivity (e.g., Gerard Roe, …) …

- Provide suggestions by topic, allowing names to appear in multiple areas. This signals who can fill multiple roles and who would be superfluous (i.e., we don't need 8 people whose primary relevant expertise is discounting), but it may get unwieldy since many will be able to be added to several categories.

- Provide a prioritized list irrelevant of topic breakdown. This highlights who we think will be key to have on the committee.

- Some combination of the above or other approach?

While there is no firm deadline, it would be great to have your thoughts soon (Thursday?) so we can send some suggestions along to Josh by the end of the week/early next week. If it would be helpful to have a short meeting to discuss let me know and I will send an invite.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

<potential committee suggestions.docx>

<2015 06 24 potential committee suggestions - alm.docx>