

# **Natural Resources Defense Council**

## **Panel Discussion**

### **Moderator:**

**Ed Chen,  
Director of Communications**

### **Speakers:**

**David Doniger,  
Director of Climate and Clean Air Program;  
David Goldston,  
Director of Government Affairs;  
Peter Altman,  
Director of the Climate and Clean Air Campaign;  
Heather Taylor,  
Director of the NRDC Action Fund;  
Kim Knowlton,  
Senior Scientist, NRDC**

**Location: NRDC, Washington, D.C.**

**Time: 9:01 a.m. EDT**

**Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2014**

*Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.*

ED CHEN: Good morning, everybody. Thank you all for coming. We've got a great panel of speakers this morning for you. We mostly want to take your questions. We have four speakers in the room here. I'll just briefly identify them, and please hold your applause until – (laughter) – I'm done.

David Doniger – he's the director of our Climate and Clean Air Program; David Goldston, director of Government Affairs; Pete Altman, director of the Climate and Clean Air Campaign; and Heather Taylor, who's the director of the NRDC Action Fund – and I'll have more of a word about that in a minute.

We have one other speaker, a fifth speaker on the phone who will be joining us: Kim Knowlton. She is a senior scientist at NRDC, and she was a co-author of the National Climate Assessment – the chapter of the assessment that you all remember covering a few weeks ago.

KIM KNOWLTON: I'm here, Ed. I'm with you. (Laughter.)

MR. CHEN: Welcome, Kim. Nice to have you.

MS. KNOWLTON: Thank you very much.

MR. CHEN: She's in New York, and she'll speak in a few minutes.

We have a bunch of NRDC experts around the room. They've graciously made themselves available to answer your questions. And they all were very key players in the development of the NRDC carbon pollution reduction approach that has gained some traction, and also in the run-up to Monday's announcement, such as Derrick Murrow, in the back, who can speak eloquently about energy efficiency and its contributions to carbon reduction; Jake Schmidt, in the back corner, to talk about the international implications of what we're trying to do; Wesley Warren, in the back – he's the director of the Center for Policy Advocacy; and many others. And so – and there are still other experts on the phone who might be asked to chime in on individual questions, including Henry Henderson, from our Chicago office, to talk about Midwest issues. And if there's anything we can't provide on the fly here, we will be happy to get back with you as soon as necessary.

And just so you all know, we're having this on-the-record briefing transcribed, and we hope to provide audio and the text of the transcript on our website by tomorrow sometime for those of you who do not need to write immediately and may want to go back and check on quotes. That will be available. And because it's being recorded, I ask each reporter to please identify yourself, especially at the start, and your affiliation. That would be great.

And naturally, I have to add: NRDC stands for the Natural Resources Defense Council. (Laughter.) Let there be no mistake today, please.

And the final note is: Heather Taylor is the director of the NRDC Action Fund, which is a affiliate, but a separate organization from NRDC. And unlike the NRDC, the NRDC Action Fund, as a 501(c)(4), is allowed to engage in certain advocacy and political activities that NRDC

cannot do. So when she speaks, she is speaking as NRDC Action Fund director, whereas the others are speaking on behalf of NRDC, the (c)(3), unless otherwise specified.

So David's going to – Doniger's going to make some opening remarks about the plan, and David Goldston will talk a little bit about what's ahead and the implications for government and for the activities that we're going to see in the coming months and years. And Pete Altman's going to talk a little bit about how we're going to really step up the advocacy to make this carbon rule happen and stick. And Heather Taylor is going to talk about how this policy is also good politics and why running clean is a smart thing to do.

So David Doniger, please take it away.

DAVID DONIGER: Thanks, Ed. I'm David Doniger.

After decades of warnings, we can see that climate change is happening here and now, doing serious damage in every part of the country. These climate impacts are being driven by heat-trapping carbon pollution. And the number one source of that pollution is the fleet of 1,600 fossil fuel-burning electric power plants, which together emit more than 2 billion tons of carbon dioxide each year – 40 percent of the nation's total CO<sub>2</sub>.

We must limit that pollution. We limit every other kind of power plant pollution: soot, smog, mercury. It's time to close the loophole for carbon pollution.

The president and his EPA already have the legal authority to act using a law already on the books: the Clean Air Act. Far from going around Congress, President Obama is carrying out his duty to faithfully execute a law Congress already enacted.

First enacted in 1970, the Clean Air Act gives EPA the responsibility to curb any air pollutant found to endanger public health or welfare, including by changing the climate. The Supreme Court has already twice upheld this authority in *Massachusetts v. EPA* in 2007 and in *American Electric Power v. Connecticut* in 2011; that case specifically concerned power plants.

In his first term, the president set strong carbon pollution and fuel-economy standards for cars and trucks. Now is the time to tackle the biggest source.

The power plant standard will be issued under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The process works as follows: The EPA sets a standard, and then states carry out that standard through state implementation plans. The EPA sets the benchmark, but the first shot at implementation is with the states. If a state declines to submit an adequate plan, then it's EPA's responsibility to implement a federal one.

We expect EPA next week to propose a fair and flexible standard, one that recognizes that each state starts with a different power-generation mix, and one that allows states and the power companies a wide range of flexible, cost-effective compliance options.

Using the same modeling platform that EPA and the industry use – (heavy breathing, laughter) – Darth Vader is on the phone – (laughter) – using the same modeling platform that EPA and industry use – the ICF Integrated Planning Model – NRDC has shown that with a fair and flexible approach, we can achieve very significant carbon reductions at modest cost and with huge public health and environment and climate benefits worth many times that cost.

For example, in our moderate full-efficiency case – and you can see that in a paper that you have – we show that we can cut carbon pollution 35 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. That's a reduction of 860 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. These carbon reductions also bring about dramatic further reductions in other power plant pollutants that cause soot and smog. And the reductions in all these pollutants get larger after 2020.

Just in 2020, we assess that the standard – this standard would prevent more than a thousand premature deaths, more than 1,500 asthma attacks, more than a thousand emergency room visits, and it will all cost less than for the mercury and air toxic standards being implemented now.

Using our approach can stimulate investments of \$86 billion in job-creating energy efficiency and renewable energy between now and 2020. Energy efficiency improvements will drive consumers' electric bills down, not up. Let me say that again. Electric bills will drop, not rise. So putting a dollar value on the lives saved, the reduced illnesses, the climate change damages: The benefits in 2020 surpass the cost by 30 (billion dollars) to \$50 billion. That's just for one year.

The key to achieving these results is mobilizing all the measures that cut carbon pollution across the electric power system – not just relatively small reductions by making coal-fired plants a bit more efficient, but also the much bigger reductions that come from shifting power generation from the dirtiest existing plants towards cleaner ones, from generating more power from renewables and other non-emitting sources, and from making our heating and cooling systems, lights, appliances and other machines do their work more efficiently. The EPA's conducted a huge listening and consulting effort, and we've seen lots of state officials and company executives expressing support for this kind of fair and flexible approach.

The process that starts next week will extend over several years. Over the next year, EPA will respond to public comments, and we're confident that millions more Americans will raise their voices in support of strong standards, and then issue final – EPA will then issue final standards in June 2015, states will have another year to craft and submit their implementation plans, and power companies will then have several years – probably until 2020 – to come into compliance.

Now is the time to act. It's our moral obligation to our children. It's America's duty to carry its own weight and lead other countries in joint global action. And it will be the president's legacy and ours too. Thank you.

DAVID GOLDSTON: So I – excuse me – I'm David Goldston. We never have only one David at an NRDC event. I'm the director of government affairs. I just want to say a word or

two on how we see the overall political context of this, and then Pete and Heather will fill in a lot of the details of what we have planned.

So I would say this is – we see this as the pivotal battle on climate change for U.S. domestic politics. I mean, really for the first time, climate is going to be front and center as the national issue. And what that means, we think, is that when this battle is over and the power plant standards are in effect, climate will be turned – have turned into an ordinary environmental issue, not something where people claim that we can't go near this or it's too hard a lift or any of those things that people, we think incorrectly, say now. So this is really the turning point battle for epochal change.

There will be – this will be contested in Congress, where there will certainly be efforts – already have been some – to block these standards going forward, and it will be contested in the states – again, that's already happening, with groups like ALEC trying to make it hard for states to carry out implementation of the standards – and it will no doubt happen in the courts. We are prepared for all those battles. It will be an extended period because of the nature of the Clean Air Act and the different stages that David just referenced in these going forward, with first the standards becoming final nationally, then the state plans and the court challenges.

But we think when this will be – when this is over and with an election – at least one election in the midst of that that Heather will talk about, obviously, this November, that, again, this issue will have been front and center, fully debated for the first time. It will be clear that the public supports and that the political system supports moving forward with these standards. The standards will then be demystified. It will be once again shown that going forward on environmental issues does not hurt the economy or create other problems, and we will be able to move forward in a very different way than the way climate politics looks now. So that's why we think these are important, A, because they actually will be effective – as David noted, they'll cause real cuts in carbon from the largest single source – but also because they will, in the end, fundamentally change the political dynamic on climate change.

So with that, why don't we turn to –

MR. CHEN: (Off mic.)

MR. GOLDSTON: Oh, Kim.

MR. CHEN: Let's turn to Kim Knowlton, on the phone from New York. She's our senior scientist who helped write the National Climate Assessment. Kim.

KIM KNOWLTON: Great. Thanks. Good morning, everyone. I want to offer my perspective as a health scientist on what the proposals are going to mean, because limiting climate change is about protecting public health and the well-being of communities today and in the future. As a health scientist, I think that climate change becomes really, really personal when we look at the public health impacts. We used to think that climate change was happening to other people, but now it's happening to us.

We see this highlighted in the recent Third National Climate Assessment report, which Ed mentioned. It's the most comprehensive look to date on how climate change is affecting Americans' health today, already, in our backyard. We're seeing more frequent extreme weather events, including heavy downpours, extreme heat, and those are fueled by climate change. For example, climate change is fueling more frequent heat waves that are lasting longer. They're covering wider areas. Remember, in Texas in 2011, many locations saw a hundred days over 100 degrees. And that heat intensifies drought and wildfire risks. And that heat is not just an inconvenience; it can be lethal. Heat waves have sent thousands of people to emergency rooms. One California heat wave in 2006 sent over 16,000 people to emergency rooms. And we've got millions of Americans who are especially vulnerable to heat, older people, children, people with heart and lung illnesses. So those people who are already struggling to stay healthy are going to see problems amplified with climate change.

Another example, there's 26 million Americans with asthma. We probably all know someone with asthma. But the rising temperatures that are being fueled by climate change worsen air pollution like ozone smog. Then you have allergens like pollen, which, along with air pollution, can trigger asthma attacks. Climate change unfortunately is also affecting the plants that produce pollen. We've already seen a lengthening in ragweed pollen seasons in the central U.S. and Canada, two to three weeks longer between 1995 and 2011. The American Thoracic Society, the professional association of lung doctors and respiratory specialists – they found that climate change is especially dangerous for kids and seniors because their lungs are more vulnerable.

All of this is costing us not just in terms of human illness and suffering. Climate change costs in dollars too. A study that we published in the journal *Health Affairs* looked at six extreme events that struck the U.S. already between 2000 and 2009. And these are types of events that are going to worsen as climate change continues: ozone smog, heat waves, coastal storms, infectious disease outbreaks, river floods, wildfires. We found that the health-related costs from those six events exceeded \$14 billion. And we know now more clearly than ever that none of us, no one among us is going to be untouched by climate changes and effects.

So speaking today as the NRDC health scientist, I'm really concerned because climate-related hazards are going to increase if we don't take action to reduce carbon pollution, which causes climate change.

Now, earlier this month 80 scientists and health professionals signed a letter sent to congressional leaders urging them to significantly cut carbon pollution and support climate preparedness efforts. So the important thing is we have this huge opportunity now to protect the health of the people and places we care about, and that's what the proposed standard is really about. We get a double benefit. We improve air quality today. We get a huge benefit in limiting heat-trapping carbon pollution that causes climate change for the future.

We've been collecting the dots for years on the links between climate change and health, but now we're connecting those dots. And we're really standing at this fork in the road. The decisions that we make today are going to affect our children and grandchildren. They're going to have to live with the consequences.

So we really can't afford not to take this huge opportunity to benefit public health and take a huge step forward and create cleaner, more secure communities by supporting these limits on heat-trapping carbon pollution.

So with that, I'll say thanks again for letting me join this conversation today. I really look forward to questions and dialogue.

PETE ALTMAN: Thanks, Kim.

My name is Pete Altman. I'm the climate and clean air campaign director for NRDC. And we absolutely see this fight over the carbon standards as essentially the Super Bowl of climate politics right now. And it's a fight to determine whether we're going to protect our health and future generations or whether we're going to end up siding with polluters and their profits. We think that just as we have federal limits on how much arsenic, lead and mercury power plants can dump into the air, we need to have limits on how much carbon pollution they can dump into the air.

So on one side, we've got the White House, whose efforts to put forward these standards are supported by hundreds of elected officials and a broad and diverse array of advocacy organizations that include environmental groups, but also include health organizations, Latino groups, African-American groups, business organizations, faith groups, labor unions, all working to get – to take responsibility for climate change and to reduce carbon pollution. Now, pushing back, of course, are polluters and their allies, led, as usual, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers and the coal interests, who are clinging desperately to an outdated, dirty energy source that the market has already been walking away from and that is – poses such a wide range of risks – in the last couple of months, we've just seen the North Carolina coal ash spill, seen the contamination of the river in West Virginia from a coal chemical spill. And the threat to our climate is this – is – writes large the danger that coal poses.

The standards to protect our health also worry the Koch brothers, who fund an intricate web of advocacy groups, like Americans for Prosperity, that are going to fight back and try to prevent the standards from being implemented, and who also support tea party politicians like Marco Rubio and Ted Cruz and Rand Paul. But we have the facts on our side and we have the public on our side. Most Americans support limiting carbon pollution from power plants. We know that from poll after poll, which Heather will get into.

And key demographic groups – women, young people, Latinos, independents – support the president's plan and support cleaning up power plants. And it isn't just from polling that we know that there's this support. Over 3.2 million comments have been submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency urging the EPA to set limits on carbon pollution from power plants. Thousands and thousands of people have turned out town hall meetings, rallies, roundtables, EPA hearings, in all 50 states, to support limiting carbon pollution.

You can see pictures, descriptions, media coverage of those events at [iwillact.us](http://iwillact.us). So you don't have to take my word for it. And I don't have any – don't have time to show pictures. But going forward, we're going to redouble our efforts and work in a coordinated way with other environmental groups and other allies. We actually started this March with a \$5 million buy combined with a digital campaign and organizing in 11 states. That resulted in over 80 meetings with senators and nearly 30 roundtables.

And then we're going to go much bigger in June with what we call climate summer, which will feature a multiplatform push with national TV ads, a digital campaign, social media, ramping up advocacy effort from environmental groups and other advocacy groups like health and business and some of the others that I named. We will have over 300 events over the course of the summer in 36 states that include elected officials, businesses people of faith, people of color coming together to say: We need to tackle this problem. And we need these limits on carbon pollution.

So beyond our own immediate effort, there are hundreds of public elected officials – senators, governors, local elected – who have made clear their commitment to reducing carbon pollution and are supporting the EPA plan. Hundreds of public health organizations, as Kim mentioned, a record number of Latino groups led by Voces Verdes urging that we put these standards into place, the Hip Hop Caucus, which is a voice for young African-Americans, recently did a multistate tour advocating for the carbon standards.

You probably noticed the pope recently offered up his views on the importance of tackling climate change. And that is being echoed by faith meetings and prayer vigils, by prayer groups throughout the U.S. And NRDC and other groups work closely with labor unions, many of whom also support carbon standards. But the most important thought to leave you with is that in – even in the business community there are a lot of companies that support moving ahead with carbon standards.

The U.S. Chamber does not speak for the United States business community. And four years ago, we saw this plainly during the carbon legislation fights when a number of their members defected because the chamber was so determined to block carbon legislation. And they were clearly carrying the water of just a few of the special interests who were members of the chamber. So now they're at it again.

But as Bloomberg recently reported, the utility industry is split. There are several utilities that are looking forward to standards or are going to – have decided not to oppose them but will work with the EPA on them. There's half a dozen other business groups that represent small businesses, clean businesses and Chambers of Commerce that are actively supporting the standards and communicating to their members and communicating to the public that they see opportunity in moving ahead. So when you go to the chamber event, just remember they are not speaking for all businesses. Why don't I stop there?

HEATHER TAYLOR-MIESLE: I'm Heather Taylor-Miesle. I'm the director of the NRDC Action Fund. As Ed said, we engage both in advocacy and electoral politics, but do spent most of our time on advocacy. And so I'm happy to be with you today.

When it comes to climate change, good policy is good politics. Voters literally see the world transforming around them as children have more asthma attacks, as our weather grows more extreme and as other countries lead to develop energy sources of tomorrow while the U.S. clings to old, dirty fossil fuels. Conventional wisdom says that candidates who support climate action will lose at the ballot box, but I'm here to tell you that the facts don't support that conventional wisdom.

According to poll after poll, and election outcome after election outcome, voters want action. They trust EPA more than they trust Congress. And candidates who lead on this issue are more likely to win than lose. Despite their best efforts and extremely deep pockets, fossil fuels backers lose much more often than they win. In 2012, the Koch brothers and their fellow polluters targeted candidates who champion the environment with more than \$270 million in TV ads in the last two months of the campaign.

But the environmental champions prevailed. In fact, the Koch brothers had a 5 percent win rate last cycle. The environmental community had almost 100 percent win rate. For an industry highly focused on its return on investment, they don't have much to show their investors when it comes to electoral politics of climate change. This goes to show that big money is not always the smarter money. Candidates this fall, prospects in 2016, and climate deniers like Rand Paul, Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz – who may eventually have to appeal to a broader electorate – would do well to pay attention.

Voters want climate action. The fact is, voters want polluters to reduce their carbon pollution. Senate candidates running in 2014 should take notice. In March, we asked Harstad Strategic Research to run a poll in the closest Senate races in the country. This was 11 different races. We asked them to ask the hard questions. We told them to phrase it how they would any candidate, how our opposition would phrase it. And Harstad really went to town. We were a little nervous, I'm not going to lie, whenever they showed us the questions they were asking in these 11 closest races in the country.

But we trusted them. Harstad specializes in America's heartland. They represent candidates like Tester, McCaskill, Mark Udall, Walsh. And they asked everything that would challenge any kind of conventional wisdom. And what we found was that the results were actually quite spectacular, even in places like Louisiana, places like Georgia, places like Arkansas. According to the polling from Harstad Strategic Research, more than two-thirds of voters in the 11 closest battleground states say EPA should limit carbon pollution from power plants.

This includes 53 percent of Republicans, 63 percent of independents and 87 percent of Democrats. Also, in what has been dubbed the year of the woman, candidates can add another list of things that women care about – supporting limits on carbon pollution. Women understand by a margin of 72 percent to 19 percent that we have a moral obligation to future generations to make the air safer to breathe and the climate more stable. This begins with holding power plants accountable for the carbon they pump into the skies. This is not news to us.

Long-term trends confirm this polling. On election night 2012, Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research polled and showed that of the six reasons to vote against the president – issues like health care, taxes, the economy, the deficit – the Republican message on energy fell completely flat down to the list – it as fifth as far as being cited by just 14 percent of voters who said it was a reason to vote against the president. The message ranked last among people who voted for Romney. It also ranked last of those people who were voting in the Midwest, where Republicans heavily focused on attacking candidates because of their stances on fossil fuels.

As we look towards November, the fossil fuel industry and their allies are going to spend a lot of money on the airwaves, and they will use their made-up accusations and their misinformation about carbon standards. But we know, because voters see the world changing around them, that they will stand with candidates who are running clean.

And I think we're ready for questions, right, Ed?

MS. : Do you have that – can you send us – is that research here?

MR. CHEN: Right. Can you tell us who – (inaudible) – the poll – yeah.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: It is. The poll is – it's right here. You will also see – what was interesting is even in the four red states that we polled – you know, places that were straight-up red – even the Republicans – the majority of Republicans supported action there. And again, these are questions that we didn't – it wasn't like we tried to alter the results by the way the questions were worded. They had carte blanche in how they asked these questions of these different voters in these 11 close races. And so we think that is some of the most convincing research that we've got out there.

MR. CHEN: Neela?

Q: Neela Banerjee with the Los Angeles Times. I wanted to go into the political issue a little bit. This administration has shown an uncanny ability, on very important issues, of getting its messaging wrong and being two steps behind the opposition. So it's one thing for environmental groups to say they're going to make a coordinated effort. What kind of – what are you hearing from the White House about how – about their messaging? And what do you think they need to do to get this right and get ahead of what will be the criticisms that are going to come out immediately?

MR. GOLDSTON: So let me start real quickly on that, and then (Peter's ?) been meeting with them a lot. So –

Q: Let's start with what you're hearing from the White House.

MR. GOLDSTON: So what we're hearing is, they're working on this constantly – I think this is very different – they brought in Podesta specifically to work on this. They understand that this is going to be – the president has said now this is one of the two big issues of his second term – they've been planning nonstop on it. They've been thinking about it

politically as well as substantively, so I think this is very different. I won't bother agreeing or disagreeing with your premise, but there's no question that they've learned both from past battles, and they've put together the team to do this, and they've been meeting with everybody who is interested, whether that's business groups, environmental groups and so forth. So I think it's very different from earlier battles that way.

MR. ALTMAN: Yeah, I'd like to add – from a messaging perspective, we think they're absolutely spot-on, that they understand what matters about this issue, and the president has been extremely effective, beginning with his State of the Union speech two speeches ago with talking about climate in a clear and compelling manner. They understand that the health impacts matter. They understand what Kim talked about, that people are beginning to see it as more of a personal issue, and that that's where they've been focused.

And we've also seen a significant escalation in the White House using the power of the administration to where the president has taken a much more proactive role – he sat down with meteorologists a couple of weeks ago when the White House released the national climate assessment in order – because we think that – we see a personal stake on the president's part in advancing this issue forward. But they've also been deploying cabinet members.

So, in fact, one of our allied groups organized an event in Iowa where Secretary Vilsack attended and spoke and brought a lot of people together. We've had cabinet officials participate in other events in other states. Gina McCarthy has been on the road meeting with both state officials as well as doing public events. So we think they're doing – following all the rest steps on this issue and talking about it in exactly the right way.

MR. CHEN: Chris?

Q: Do I need that, or no?

MS. : Oh, no, you're fine.

Q: Chris Joyce with National Public Radio. This is likely to be litigated. I suppose you expect it to be litigated. And in the context of what happened in the Supreme Court, where do you see Chamber of Commerce at all attacking the Clean Air Act? Where is the weakness? Where is the potential weakness in the Clean Air Act that you expect? And what is your plan – I'm sure you're talking about it already – about how you defend it when NRDC files friend-of-the-court?

MR. DONIGER: Well, EPA is running a pretty good string right now of victories in the courts – in the Supreme Court and the court of appeals, and the position that they are – if they take a position like the one we're recommending, they'll be on very strong ground. The latest Supreme Court decision is very clear that the agency has leeway to deal with problems as they evolve using the law that was written as long as 44 years ago, and they get – they're supposed to get a substantial amount of deference from the courts. If they do their job well, they explain what they're doing well and they have a solid record of technical information and backup where they are, so we're feeling very confident.

All of the carbon cases so far have gone in EPA's and our favor. If you count Massachusetts – that was in our favor – and not the old EPA's, but it's in the new EPA's favor. There is one case pending that will come down sometime between now and the end of June in the Supreme Court. I just want to emphasize that no matter how that case comes out, it will not affect what EPA is about to propose on standards, because it's about secondary permit provisions of the act. We think EPA has a good chance of winning that case, but even if they lose, the power that the EPA has to set the standards we've been talking about under the Clean Air Act is very secure; the Supreme Court has already upheld it twice and signified in the briefing and in the argument of the case I'm talking about that they're not going back on any of that.

So lawsuits are a part of the normal business. The track record of the Chamber, the red state governors and so on in attacking EPA's carbon standards is abysmal. They have lost everything so far. And we're quite confident that EPA, with the support from groups like ours, will do very well in the courts.

MR. CHEN: John (sp)?

Q: This is for Heather. Pertaining to your poll, are red state and purple state Democratic senators who occasionally vote with the Republicans on this issue – are they out of touch with their constituents? Is that – essentially, can we draw that from your polling? And secondly, how important in this ethical battle going forward is that the Democratic hold the Senate after this fall?

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: Those are really good questions. First I would say, yes, I do think that they're out of touch. I do think that the polling, just as, kind of, like your traditional political hack here – I do think the polling's changed and become much stronger in the last few years, and I'm wondering if – you know, these guys only have to run every six years, right? And so I'm wondering if they've really tested the issue as well as they should be testing the issue. You'll have to ask them about what their motives are, but I do think that this poll clearly says – I mean, Harstad is not an environmental pollster – let's just be clear – they are a candidate pollster. And so I think that this poll really, you know, truly demonstrates that they need to go back and ask the hard questions.

I think the reason we've seen the switch, though, is because people are seeing this around them. Their children are more likely not to be able to breathe well. They're not allowed to go outside during red days. What's – you know, I was raised in Kentucky. A red day? Like, what's that? You know, that's not something that they had to deal with when they were children, and so I do think that they need to go back and they need to ask the hard questions.

And for the record, I believe that to be the case with Republicans, too. The NRDC Action Fund is a nonpartisan group; we actually are supporting Republicans and Democrats this cycle very proudly, and so we believe that an environmental majority is going to have to take people from both sides of the aisle, and that's what we're working towards.

I don't think that there's any question, though, that Harry Reid's going to be better on our issues than Mitch McConnell if he prevails against Alison Lundergan Grimes, and so for right now, I think that – I think that it's more important for us to have Harry Reid, and so holding the Senate, while not our main objective, is something that, of course, we have to be concerned about, because leadership is the one who sets the agenda on the floor.

MR. GOLDSTON: Just one quick thing on the – (inaudible) – stuff. I mean, you can see Democrats in these contested states being more vocal on climate change, Kay Hagan being a clear example, where she gave a very forceful floor speech- went out of her way to do that on climate. So I think, you know, you can see that elected officials are voted with their feet on this and with their vocal cords and bearing out the notion that they feel this is where their constituents are going to be.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: The other thing I just want to – a couple of other names that David just reminded me of – so you saw Marco Rubio come out and start to question it, and by Tuesday, he's at the National Press Club trying to nuance his words, right? You know, so I even think Republicans are starting to realize this. You see Rick Scott on the front page of the Miami Herald – actually, maybe not the front, but in the Miami Herald today saying that he doesn't know if climate change is real, because he's not a scientist, whereas before, he was a denier.

So I do think that even Republicans, at this point, are starting to go, oh, maybe I need to reconsider this, because you see people – Gary Peters, who's running for Senate up there to fill Levin's seat – here's a guy who's using climate denial to his advantage. He's basically using it to show that Terri Lynn Land, the Republican candidate running against him, is out of step, and maybe not smart enough to represent the state of Michigan in the Senate, because she doesn't actually trust the science that's out there.

And so we see all these candidates, one after another, going, maybe I'm on the wrong side of this, and they're starting to walk back their words, and I think that's really important. I think that's going to be something you see all over the place in the next couple of months, and I, for one, am looking forward to it.

MR. ALTMAN: I want to add something about Rick Scott, just because I think considerable attention was drawn to the fact that Florida is ground zero for climate change, so they are – they are really experiencing the impacts already on a day-to-day basis and they know the danger therein.

Rick Scott may have noticed that the president of the Evangelical and Environmental Network was on TV twice last week, CNN and then MSNBC, saying we need Rick Scott to pay attention to this issue because God calls us to be caretakers of creation, and people are really at risk from this. And so I just thought that was an interesting example because that's where the faith voices come out really loud and clear in Florida on this issue.

The other is John Walsh in Montana did an event a few weeks ago with – a public event with a bunch of people talking about the need to tackle climate change. And John Tester, during his last election, ran standing up for the environment and clean air and clean energy and won. So

we are seeing a shift, in fact, where elected officials are beginning to understand that they can be in a better place by being on the right side of this issue, not all of them, but we're moving ahead.

Q: Josh – yeah, Josh Hunter with AP. To build on my colleague's question, it seems like once this inevitably enters the location phase, the likeliest point of tension or a likely point of tension will be over some of the murkier sections of the Clean Air Act and, specifically, whether 111(d) can be used to apply methods that are so-called outside the fence.

Assuming that the administration does go in the direction of the plan that NRDC has developed, what legal basis do you see for 111(d) to be used to regulate outside the fence?

MR. DONIGER: Well, first of all, let's be clear that the sources which would be regulated are the carbon dioxide-emitting power plants. The question really is what are the tools they have to comply with? Is it only hardware that they can install on their own facility, or can they take advantage of credits and averaging with facilities and the – and the energy efficiency at the end use in our buildings. Can we create a system in which there are compliance instruments, credits, that they can use to supplement their compliance in addition to the things they do to directly clean up the facilities.

We crossed that river a long time ago with the acid rain program. We crossed that river a long time ago with credit programs all over the Clean Air Act, and the language in Section 111(d) is of the same kind – it even refers to the language in another section, Section 110, which authorizes these marketable trading and averaging crediting mechanisms.

So we think that this can be done in a very sound, legal manner. It's not new.

MR. GOLDSTON: And just one quick thing that also gets back to Neela's question, which is the White House has been, you know, acutely aware of this question as they've been preparing, so, I mean, this has been part of the idea they've gotten and statements that, I think, emboldened correctly by the recent Supreme Court decisions, but this is not something that's going to catch anyone off-guard. This is part of the overall planning for the – for the standards coming out.

MR. CHEN: Question down here.

Q: William Marsden from Postmedia News. My question -- I have two questions, actually. But I was wondering if you give us a clear of how many utility companies are going to be affected by this? And of those companies, how many – and you spoke to this a little bit earlier – support action and how many do not? In other words, these guys are going to be the block that you're up against. So could you sort of define that in more precise terms for us?

MR. DONIGER: Well actually a little bit later today, NRDC and other organizations are putting out a report, a benchmarking report, and it's again – it tabulates the emissions of all these 1,600 power plants by the company that owns them for the top 100 companies.

And you can see an enormous diversity in the carbon intensity and the amount of the emissions that different companies have. Some of them have a very heavy carbon emissions profile and others of them have a much lighter profile. And you – if you examine the names, you'll find in the most recent press reports that some of the ones with – which are in a better position are actually speaking out in favor of an approach like this.

Now, all of them are holding their fire until they see what the proposal is. Even American Electric Power, which is one of the carbon-heavy carbon-intense companies, has spoken out and saying that they prefer flexible approaches to inflexible ones, that they prefer these what have come to be called these outside-the-fence-line mechanisms to an approach that doesn't have them. So we'll have to see where they – where they are.

And the other thing I would note is that this report shows that even the ones with the heaviest carbon profile have been making improvements since 2005-2008, which is the – with the peak years of carbon emissions for the country and for the power system. That corresponds to the lower price and availability of natural gas, but also the lower price and availability of wind, of solar, of energy efficiency. All of those alternates have been gaining, coal has been losing and the carbon profile of these companies has been coming down so that some of them are a third or even halfway towards meeting the standard that we proposed for 2020 already just as a result of market forces and the – and the other EPA standards.

MR. CHEN: Down here.

Q: Yeah. Lee Logan with Inside EPA. So as you go through the timelines with this stuff, a lot of the implementation and the defense of the standards is going to happen after President Obama leaves, so what do you need to do to, you know, to make sure that enough of it is in place, you know, while he's still in office?

MR. DONIGER: So the president's climate action plan last year included a schedule, which they are – which if the thing comes out next week, they will be spot-on meeting; actually, they'll be a day late because he asked for the standards to come out on Sunday. But, you know, the rest of the schedule is calibrated so that the final standard would be done a year from now.

There would be 13 months for states to submit plans. There'd be a period of time in 2016 for EPA to approve or disapprove those plans, and I hope it isn't necessary, but to start this federal plan process in case of any state that doesn't submit a plan. So we think the solid base of all the steps can be done in this term, will be done within this term.

Many of the states would be – including states you wouldn't necessarily think of it based on their sort of color profile – are looking very closely at this, A, because the utilities in those states want the state to take the lead – they don't want to have a federal plan come down over which they might have so much control; and B, because there's a lot of opportunity.

As my colleague said, that it's exciting. You know, there's a big battle going on in Ohio over energy efficiency standards and renewable standards. The question is whether to repeal some of the requirements, and the energy efficiency and renewables businesses which have got

their roots in the ground in the last two years because of the – those programs are opposing the supposed business-friendly efforts to roll back these measures.

So – and even – and I would also point you to even the state of Texas when it filed comments earlier this year, or late last year, on EPA's plans. The first four pages or so of the 12 or 15 pages say go away, we don't want to hear from you, get lost. And the last 10 or 12 pages say but if you're going to do this, please give us credit for all the changes from coal to gas, from coal to wind, for energy efficiency that have gone on in the last decade here in the great state of Texas.

MR. ALTMAN: I just want to add a little bit to that. In terms of what do we have to do, the EPA has been doing an extraordinary amount of outreach to the regulators who will be the ones who've got to write up the specifics about how their state will meet the carbon standard. They've met with the utility commissions and the environmental agencies for all of the states, and we think that most of the states have begun grappling with, OK, how are we going to figure out our own plan for meeting this standard.

They've got a year to think about it, and then next year, when the final standards emerge, they'll have a year to actually put together plans and get them into the EPA, which will – so those are due June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016, and then the EPA's got several months to approve the plans that states are submitting. So it is a tight time frame, but there's been an enormous amount of legwork already done. NRDC has certainly been very busy on that front as well, working with states. So we think it will move along.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: And let me – can I – just really quick. I just also want to make clear I don't believe a person can win the White house in 2016 that is a climate denier. I just don't think the polling yields any kind of result that way. And so I do believe that by the end of 2016, we'll have a lot of these standards in place, but it's not like we believe that the work ends the day the president leaves office. We believe that the next president who will be elected will be somebody who will champion this issue, because we believe that the voters are going to be calling for that on a very regular basis. I think we're going to see that in 2016, and I believe that the polling's just going to get stronger in the next couple years.

MR. GOLDSTON: So two really quick things. One, the White House is acutely aware of the timing, right, they've worked that out, so I think, you know, court cases may go beyond, but this has been timed so that everything is in effect.

The second thing, for people who don't cover this much, is that the state-by-state process is something that has been used repeatedly in the Clean Air Act. It's how all the standards are done on smog and soot. There's nothing novel about that process. It's parallel to what's done in other parts of the Clean Air Act. States have been doing this all along. So this is not a new feature of Clean Air Act policy, and states are well aware of that.

MR. CHEN: A question over here.

Q: Hi. Zack Colman with Washington Examiner. Just wondering, what is the benchmark that you all are looking for, the benchmark year, the baseline year? I guess, David, you were talking about, you know, you don't want to have these utilities get credit for something from maybe 10 years ago; you know, that that makes it less stringent of a standard, the reductions less drastic. So what are you looking at? And if it's too far in the past of a benchmark, is there a chance that you all would go to court on this?

MR. DONIGER: So the question of the baseline, where do you start from, is obviously connected to how far can you go by an out year like 2020. And so we put a proposal together – we started our work in 2011, so we picked the average of the three prior years. There are others who advocate going back to 2005. I'm not hearing anybody advocating going back further than that. There's actually very little difference between the emissions in 2005 and 2008. So we think this is a less important issue than it appears.

It's more important to have an ambitious standard taking – you decide where you're going to start from and then you have an ambitious standard to make as much reduction as you can by 2020 and 2025. And as I've given as an example, we've shown how you can get 35 percent reduction below 25 – below 2005 levels by 2020. We actually have runs that show you can get above 40 percent.

Q: But is there a chance that you go to court if it's not stringent enough? I mean, I'm reminded of the stimulus, right, where you had some people saying the administration didn't do enough for the stimulus. I mean, is there a chance that the administration can't do enough for climate control?

MR. DONIGER: We don't know what EPA's going to propose next. We are hopeful and confident that it will be a good and strong proposal and they will ask for comment on ranges that allow for, you know, more reduction or less reduction. We are going to advocate during the comment period for the strongest possible reduction. I think the bigger risk of litigation – (chuckles) – is from the other side.

MR. CHEN: Steve – (last name inaudible) – you had a question.

Q: I'm just wondering whether in the end this all is a little bit like an EPA – not that this is necessarily a problem, but doesn't this all end up looking a little bit like an EPA-imposed RPS program, where essentially by going – by allowing people to mix together renewables to lower their carbon intensity, that's more or less the same thing as when – (off mic)?

MR. DONIGER: Our view of this is – first of all, those are good ideas, renewable – (laughter).

Q: That's what I was saying, not necessarily a problem for you, but – (off mic).

MR. DONIGER: And efficiency. But you know, working within the Clean Air Act, as I explained earlier, the obligation needs to fall on the carbon-emitting plant. We don't actually regulate somebody who doesn't emit carbon. But the question then is, considering that the power system is a system and all these plants are connected, and a utility company president

sitting there decides hour by hour, which plant am I going to dispatch from, and when he looks into his investment decisions, which things do I want to build, which things do I want to retire, this is the way they make these decisions. They consider all the resources, including, increasingly, does it make sense for me to invest in reducing power needs in a building like this rather than in building a new power plant to service an inefficient building? They make these decisions this way. It makes sense to structure the compliance instruments and compliance structure that way.

Q: So wouldn't it be – I mean, if you're in an RPS state which already has pretty aggressive goals, wouldn't that essentially mean that you wouldn't have any impact with these new EPA regs?

MR. DONIGER: We think that – we constructed this proposal to move from the starting point to 2020 and 2025 to make reductions over that period. We don't care in this proposal whether that reduction – whether any part of that reduction would have been driven by a state policy already in place, would have been driven by the pure economics. Everything that changes things towards the reduced emissions counts, and if you're pushing the rock down a hill, it's a lot easier than if you have to push the rock up a hill.

MR. ALTMAN: I'd just like to add –

Q: Do you know how many states might not actually be affected at all as a result of that?

MR. DONIGER: We think almost every state has to do something. And some of the states have planned to do it already. For example, the Northeastern states a year or so ago strengthened their original greenhouse gas emission target very substantially. And depending upon what EPA does, they may be able to demonstrate that what they're doing is equivalent. That's not to denigrate what they're doing. They got out ahead.

MR. ALTMAN: I would just add, if somebody wants to make the argument against EPA standards because it will cause more clean energy, good luck. But the other is that EPA sets the standards; states have to figure it out. So states that already have an RPS in place or states that have efficiency standards in place are pretty well positioned to be able to meet the standards, and many states are looking forward to the opportunity to build on those assets that they've already been investing, and which is one of the reasons why we think a lot of states and there's a lot of businesses that see opportunity in these standards, opportunity to grow clean-energy businesses, which put more people to work per dollar invested and create a whole number of additional benefits at the state level.

Q: That's part of the reason I was asking. It just seems politically like it's going to be a limited effect this time -- it's affecting a more limited group than –

MR. GOLDSTON: Yeah, I mean, your question underscores the fact that, I mean, the state-by-state basis does allow different approaches, different ways of doing it. I mean and that's one of the hallmarks of the proposal, partly because of the way the Clean Air Act is structured, that it's not going to be a one-size-fits-all and the kind of language about imposing something on

states that they can't handle. The very questions you're asking underscore how weak a line of argument that is.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: Getting to the –

MR. DONIGER: One last one on this, and then – the states that haven't done any of these things have opportunities that the states which have done them don't have. A state which hasn't built up renewables or an efficiency program has a very cheap pathway in front of them.

MR. CHEN: We have time for a few more questions. And just a reminder: Tomorrow NRDC is going to be putting out some more details of our proposals, so please stay tuned for – you know that there's this event tomorrow.

MR. ALTMAN: Let me just add that that will include our analysis of job creation as well as electrical savings from our proposal on the carbon savings.

MR. CHEN: That's tomorrow.

Cate (sp).

Q: The environmental groups in general, and the NRDC included in some ways, have been critical of gas development as it is right now in the U.S. Are there any provisions on how much of this should or could be met by switching to gas?

MR. DONIGER: Our analysis shows that if you have a proper – if you have a strong emphasis on the energy efficiency opportunity, which is the lowest-cost approach anyway, that what happens in the end is that gas stays about the same. It doesn't go up more than it's going to go up. And there's a lot of steps in between, but efficiency replaces coal. It doesn't replace all coal. In our proposal, by 2020 there's still three-quarters as much coal generation as there was expected to be with no carbon standards. But efficiency is what makes the difference, and you don't see a big run-up in gas.

MR. CHEN: Bill?

Q: Bill Sternberg, USA Today. From a global perspective, how much good will these standards do in the absence of similar action by the other major emitters, typically China?

MR. CHEN: Let's let Jake take that one. Jake Schmidt?

JAKE SCHMIDT: Oh, sure. So thanks.

MR. CHEN: I'll come with the microphone so you can – (off mic).

MR. SCHMIDT: So they matter quite a bit. When I, you know, meet with officials in China and India, their ministers and climate negotiators – and I always want to talk to them about what they're doing, what steps are you doing – the first three questions I always get is, what's

happening in the United States? And more recently, what's happening in the power sector? People are very closely paying attention to what signals the U.S. sends in terms of how it's going to deal with the biggest source of carbon pollution that's unregulated. Everybody understands that this is a big deal in terms of whether or not the U.S. is going to deliver upon its international commitment.

And our ability to go into conversations with China and encourage them to make even deeper efforts is going to depend largely on whether or not the signals coming of this send that right pathway. And so as we all know, if anybody – many of your outlets have already written the dynamics have changed quite a bit in China. The air pollution is the number-one issue in terms of social unrest and the dynamics in China are going to change very quickly in the next couple of months and years as the country grapples with the air pollution. And things like capping coal, things like reducing its coal consumption are very much in play in China in the next couple of years. And so Chinese officials and Indian officials I think are very closely watching the developments in the power plant standards.

MR. DONIGER: Every country needs to know that every other big country is in the game. This is the United States' way to show that it's in the game.

MR. GOLDSTON: Yeah, I mean, just to underscore the same point another way, I mean, this is the prerequisite, I think, for the other international steps. So, I mean, basically to argue that you won't be able to graduate if you don't take the 400 class and ignore that you first have to take the 100-level class is not a very convincing argument.

MELISSA JO HARRISON: We have a question down here.

Q: Maureen Grobny (ph) with Gnet (ph). Can you talk more about the states that have the farthest to go, that – have they – have done the least and have the biggest carbon emissions, like Indiana? How is this going to be fair to them? You said they have some least-cost – some low-cost steps at their disposal. Can you talk more about that?

MR. DONIGER: Well, so, to re-emphasize that in our proposal – and we think EPA is somewhere going to embody this – we differentiate between the states. We have a different target for each state, which is – which depends on where they start. So the states that have historically had nearly all coal generation would have to make an improvement, but it would be from where they start. And the – an improvement rate that they can make may well be greater, may be faster than you could expect from, let's say, a state like California because, as I was saying earlier, Indiana has not done the things it – that have worked in California. They have a lot of low-hanging fruit that California has already picked.

And if – I'd just point you to Kentucky. Kentucky has issued a plan, and in the background section of the plan it notes that their fuel mix is shifting. It was in the high 90s percent coal-based generation. By 2020, I think they expect – and this is without the standards – to be down in the 70s. So there's a transition going on in a state like that, and a lot of it is extremely low cost. And if they invest in efficiency in ways that some states already have,

they're going to find a really big pot of low-cost emission reductions just waiting there to be scooped up.

Q: So you see that primarily through efficiency standards or –

MR. DONIGER: Well, they're shifting – they have already shifted in Kentucky. They report that the percentage of gas generation is coming up. I think – I don't know if they report that wind is coming up, but there are – there are renewables opportunities all over the – that part of the country, especially solar energy in the Southeast, and the efficiency opportunities. So they have – they have lots of ways to reduce emissions.

MS. HARRISON: We have another question right here.

Q: Tim McDonnell from Mother Jones. Just one more question about the politics. Where do you expect this to be the biggest issue in the midterm elections? I mean, where do you think this is going to kind of be coming up the most, in which states and –

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: We're seeing it in a lot of places already. Definitely Michigan has been the issue de jour here lately. I will note, though – just a little tidbit of information – Peters was down a month ago, actually about six weeks ago, and the only messaging he has used for the last month is on climate change and now his numbers are he's up 5. I don't want to pretend like that's all because of climate change. I think it's also because he got out there and he started talking to the people, but I do think that's a really interesting little tidbit and it's going to be really interesting to watch the rest of the race.

I think it will pop in Colorado. We're already seeing it pop there. They attempted to – the other side tried to frame Kay Hagan on this. They found out it wasn't actually a really good message in North Carolina so they've backed off there. And in fact it hurt them, it seemed like, in that state, so maybe it could be a circumstance where we could see Kay Hagan even go on the offensive. I have no knowledge of that, just to be clear. We have also seen it pop in Alaska. Begich seems to be hanging in there and handling it on his own there as well. But I think that's where you'll see it.

Florida, you know, we don't really monitor the governors' races as closely as we do in other of – the Senate races, but I do think that, you know, seeing Rick Scott – Rick Scott actually – I don't know if you guys saw this story. He declined to answer and that became a news story. His climate denial was just basically like, I don't know; I'm not a scientist, and that became a major news story. And so I do think that, you know, Florida is paying attention, and so I believe that this will become something to pay attention to.

MR. : On the –

MR. ALTMAN: Could I just add to that? Sorry. So right now, in fact, the National Mining Association has some radio ads up in half-a-dozen states which NRDC on Friday sent a letter to radio stations asking them to take it down because it contains false and misleading claims about the impact of carbon standards on electric grids. And we're going to fight those

kinds of claims and that line of attack from the NMA and the chamber and NAM consistently, and we'll try to make sure that they can't – you know, they can't air false and misleading information.

I think that – you know, as Heather pointed out, in the last election an awful lot of money was put into trying to get rid of environmental champions. At the end of the day I think that although the chamber – every – virtually every time somebody proposes cleaning up the air, the chamber, you know, goes into the prediction of apocalypse mode. And virtually every time, or every time, they have been proven wrong. We've got –

MR. DONIGER: It's a good thing their members don't run their companies the way the chamber projects the future. (Laughter.)

MR. ALTMAN: Thank you. You're right. You know, we've seen it again and again. And the claims like what the National Mining Association put out last week are going to be very similar to what, you know, people would hear from the chamber later today. And they've been proven wrong again and again and again, and we're going to hold them to a line of they have got to stick to the facts. But we've got more facts on our side, I think.

MS. HARRISON: We have another question in the back.

Q: I'm Alex –

MS. HARRISON: And I think we'll take one more after this one.

Q: I'm Alex Panetta from the Canadian Press News Agency. Given that the – probably the noisiest environmental debate over the last couple of years has involved the construction of a certain pipeline from my country – (laughter) – I'm just wondering if we can put in context this issue compared to Keystone in two ways, the first whether these regulations are successful and do what you hope they do, whether that changes the political equation on the importance of the Keystone issue, first of all.

And second of all, if we can compare the two issues by orders of magnitude in terms of emissions, how important – sort of to help the general public understand how many more times these regulations, like, you know, percentagewise, how many more emission –

MR. GOLDSTON: David will start on the second issue and then I'll take the first.

MR. DONIGER: Yeah, I'd just say that our view is we need to stop building new infrastructure that commits us to decades of high-carbon energy. And that's the fundamental basis of our position on that – on that pipeline that will not be named. (Laughter.) And what we're about here is cleaning up existing infrastructure that emits so much carbon.

MR. GOLDSTON: I think the debate over the Keystone pipeline has, you know, helped rally elements of the public on climate. I think this will – the standards will rally an even broader amount, and so that will – again, climate action will seem like much more of a necessity

and a routine step, and that will have implications for the pipeline as well. Obviously the timing of the two, it's uncertain how they're going to interact.

MS. HARRISON: I thought I saw a hand right here. This will be our last question. Thank you.

Q: Lauren Gardner from CQ. Back to the politics of this – David, I think you were talking earlier about how you think this rule is the – could be the political sea change on climate, that there's been a lot of polling that climate change ranks relatively low among voters in terms of their priorities. I think Heather kind of hit on that with the Gary Peters race, that it's not the only issue. So how do you envision this climate – how do you envision climate politics persisting into the future and staying at the forefront –

MR. GOLDSTON: So I think a couple of things. First of all, I think it's going to move up as people – as the issue gets more attention, so that will put it more in the public mindset. But I think, frankly, the metric of where it ranks on daily issues for the public really doesn't – is not so essential. What matters is will the public support action, and that's where the polls are pretty not only consistent but incontrovertible that the public does support action. And again, as that happens action becomes more and more routine. The arguments against it become harder and harder to defend.

And so I think the idea that climate – climate doesn't have to rank as the most important issue to have it – to have climate politics be something – climate action be acceptable, important public politics. So I think – I think, frankly, the – where climate ranks in terms of public awareness is mostly a red herring.

MR. : Right.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: That's important. I just – but just really quickly –

MS. HARRISON: And I know – that's right. Let's let – Yeah, let's let Heather have the last word.

MS. TAYLOR-MIESLE: Yeah, I was going to just say the rising American electorate here is really important for people to understand. The three groups that actually want climate action the most are women, are young people, are Latinos, and those are the three groups that will win in the 2016 election, probably will be the ones who elect most of Congress in the 20145 election as well.

And so if people want to be leaders into the future, this is an issue that they will have to take seriously, whether it's first on the list or whether it's sixth on the list. It just doesn't matter. And so I think that as we go forward, people are going to be looking for leadership on a – on a number of different issues. This will be one of them. Climate denial will not last. And I don't think that anyone is going to be able to get elected into the future if they continue this line of messaging.

MR. GOLDSTON: Can I just say one last thing? It partly gets back to Bill's question.

So first of all, you know, these concerns about international presuppose that this is going to be a disaster if we go forward, right, and so why should we take this step if we need other countries to take action also? So we don't accept that basic premise. We think the information Pete talked about, that we'll be putting out tomorrow, will show that actually there are mostly advantages to moving forward. And so it's much more, why not do this anyway?

The other is – and this maybe will get back to the –

MR. ALTMAN: Well, can –

MR. GOLDSTON: Go ahead, then I'll make the list.

MR. ALTMAN: The reason is because it's the right thing to do, and there is something that the U.S. can do about it. And people recognize we do have an obligation to protect future generations and to protect their health, and they support taking action. And sometimes we do have to be the moral leader and rely on the fact that other nations will follow our leadership. But we have to lead in order for them to follow, and this is how we do that.

MR. GOLDSTON: The other thing –

Q: Well, most OECD countries would say that the United States is a laggard in all of this.

(Cross talk.)

MR. ALTMAN: Well, we don't think that they will say that as we get these standards in place.

MR. GOLDSTON: That's the point. That's why it's – that's why it's a prerequisite.

The other thing is, I think you'll see in terms of the politics that the other side is trying out all sorts of arguments, which is a sign that they – that they acknowledge that this is not simple, that the landscape is really not – necessarily we're there. They can't decide whether they want to attack the science. That looks less and less politically successful because you look like some kind of throwback. So that's fallen off the charts. They're going to try all sorts of economic arguments where we think there's less and less – it's easier and easier to prove that those arguments don't carry weight. When that fails in the past they sometimes use the international arguments.

But I think what you're seeing is they're facing a landscape where it's not clear to them even how they win on this anymore, and I think that's why they're going to be throwing everything at the wall. I think we're prepared for all that, as is the White House. And this will indeed be the pivotal fight where in the end it won't be an argument about whether to take action on climate change.

MS. HARRISON: And with that, let's let Ed Chen wrap up. (Laughter.)

MR. CHEN: Thank you all. Thank you all for coming. Thank you.

MR. : Tune in tomorrow.

(END)