

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

2 - - - - - x

3 UTILITY AIR REGULATORY GROUP, :

4 Petitioner : No. 12-1146

5 v. :

6 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; :

7 - - - - - x

8 - - - - - x

9 AMERICAN CHEMISTRY :

10 COUNCIL, ET AL., :

11 Petitioners : No. 12-1248

12 v. :

13 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, :

14 ET AL., :

15 - - - - - x

16 - - - - - x

17 ENERGY-INTENSIVE MANUFACTURERS :

18 WORKING GROUP ON GREENHOUSE GAS :

19 REGULATION, ET AL., :

20 Petitioners : No. 12-1254

21 v. :

22 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, :

23 ET AL., :

24 - - - - - x

25 - - - - - x

1 SOUTHEASTERN LEGAL FOUNDATION, :

2 INC., ET AL., :

3 Petitioners : No. 12-1268

4 v. :

5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, :

6 ET AL., :

7 - - - - - x

8 - - - - - x

9 TEXAS, ET AL., :

10 Petitioners : No. 12-1269

11 v. :

12 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, :

13 ET AL., :

14 - - - - - x

15 - - - - - x

16 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF :

17 THE UNITED STATES, ET AL., :

18 Petitioners : No. 12-1272

19 v. :

20 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, :

21 ET AL., :

22 - - - - - x

23 Washington, D.C.

24 Monday, February 24, 2014

25

1 The above-entitled matter came on for oral
2 argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
3 at 10:05 a.m.

4 APPEARANCES:

5 MR. PETER KEISLER, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
6 the Private Party Petitioners.

7 MR. JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ., Solicitor General of
8 Texas, Austin, Texas; on behalf of State Petitioners.

9 DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ., Solicitor General,
10 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
11 Respondents.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	C O N T E N T S	
		PAGE
1		
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
3	MR. PETER KEISLER, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Private Party Petitioners	5
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	MR. JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the State Petitioners	33
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Respondents	45
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
12	MR. PETER KEISLER, ESQ.	
13	On behalf of the Private Party Petitioners	88
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (10:05 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4 argument this morning in Case 12-1146, Utility Air
5 Regulatory Group v. The Environmental Protection Agency
6 and the consolidated cases.

7 Mr. Keisler.

8 ORAL ARGUMENT OF PETER KEISLER

9 ON BEHALF OF THE PRIVATE PARTY PETITIONERS

10 MR. KEISLER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
11 please the Court:

12 The situation presented by this case is, to
13 our knowledge, unprecedented in at least two respects.
14 First, EPA agrees that if its interpretation of the PSD
15 and Title V statutes is adopted, then applying other
16 provisions of those same statutes would, according to
17 their terms, would in EPA's words result in a program
18 that would have been unrecognizable to the Congress that
19 enacted it, and so contrary to Congress's intent that
20 the agency calls it absurd.

21 And second, EPA took that conclusion not as
22 a reason to reexamine its interpretation, but as a basis
23 for rewriting other provisions of the statutes that are
24 clear and unambiguous, the numerical permitting
25 thresholds that Congress enacted, because the agency

1 wrongly believes that fixes the problem. And this is
2 not a single one-time act of statutory rewriting, as
3 problematic as that alone would be, because the agency
4 has said it intends to continually adjust and readjust
5 thresholds into the indefinite future based on its
6 ongoing assessment of the cost and benefits of
7 regulation. So --

8 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Keisler, I'm sorry. Can
9 I ask about your interpretation of the phrase "any air
10 pollutant?" Because there are a lot of different
11 interpretations that have gone on among the various
12 briefs and among the lower court opinions in this case.
13 So here are some choices, all right? And I want really
14 to ask you to pick what you're arguing for.

15 Your original position was that "any air
16 pollutant" meant any NAAQS pollutant for which the area
17 is in attainment; that was your original position.

18 Judge Kavanaugh's position is that it means any NAAQS
19 pollutant. There is another position that goes on in
20 the briefs that says no, it doesn't mean any NAAQS
21 pollutant; it means any local pollutant, whether or not
22 it's a NAAQS pollutant; and there is still another
23 position that says it's really any regulated pollutant
24 other than greenhouse gases.

25 So those are four different interpretations

1 that all of the folks on your side, and I realize there
2 are a lot of them, have presented. And I guess I'm
3 asking you which one you're arguing for.

4 MR. KEISLER: Yes. Your Honor, I'm here on
5 behalf of all the private party Petitioners, and we have
6 two arguments. Our principal argument and the one I
7 would like to focus on first is that while other
8 programs of the Clean Air Act give EPA authority to
9 regulate greenhouse gases from stationary sources, PSD
10 does not. And that is because -- and this is where I
11 would choose one of the options Your Honor gave me --
12 and that is because the PSD program is exclusively
13 focused on emissions that have area-specific air quality
14 impacts, and not on globally undifferentiated phenomena.
15 I wouldn't use the words --

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: May I ask --

17 JUSTICE KAGAN: When you say area-specific,
18 I mean, I take it that these sort of ozone pollutants
19 are not area-specific. Would your interpretation
20 exclude those as well?

21 MR. KEISLER: If the EPA couldn't make a
22 regulatory finding that they had an area-specific air
23 quality impact, yes. Now, the Solicitor --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could I ask you a
25 follow-up to Justice Kagan? Now that's a fifth

1 interpretation by your side. That to me is the
2 quintessential ambiguity in a statute where we give
3 deference to the agency. So if your side can't even
4 come to one interpretation, why shouldn't we defer to
5 the agency?

6 MR. KEISLER: Well, first of all, Your
7 Honor, the deference that an agency is afforded is
8 always going to be limited to reasonable
9 interpretations, and we would start out with the premise
10 that an interpretation that requires the agency to
11 rewrite other provisions of the Act is not reasonable.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, it hasn't
13 rewritten them. All it has said, as I understand it,
14 and I don't understand -- other than your view that
15 there are too many people it's regulating, is that we
16 can't implement it immediately, because it would
17 overburden us administratively. It hasn't said that
18 over time, with streamlining and with other adjustments,
19 that it can't do this. It's just said we can't do it
20 right away.

21 MR. KEISLER: That is right, Your Honor.
22 And that actually reflects a deeper problem, and I'd
23 like to address that and then also explain why our
24 position we think is the correct and only correct
25 interpretation of the statute on the broader question.

1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Before you do that, can
2 you clarify whether or not you agree with the dissenting
3 judges on the D.C. Circuit? That is, if we limit it to
4 criteria pollutants, even so, BACT must be installed for
5 greenhouse gases. You seemed in your main brief to
6 agree with that. You have a footnote saying it's got a
7 heck of a lot of differences. It's 86 percent of the
8 emissions on the government's theory; 83 on yours. But
9 your reply brief seems to turn 180 degrees from that.

10 MR. KEISLER: And -- and let me sort that
11 out. And I recognize, Your Honor, that having six
12 opening briefs isn't the most effective or most helpful
13 way to the Court to present our position. So let me
14 express on behalf of all the private Petitioners, there
15 are two arguments.

16 Our principal argument, and the one I would
17 like to focus on the most, is that greenhouse gases are
18 not included within the PSD program at all. They can't
19 trigger its applicability and they wouldn't be subject
20 to the Best Available Control Technology determination.

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, again, that's because
22 they're not local.

23 MR. KEISLER: Because they don't have
24 area-specific air quality impacts, yes.

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, what do you make --

1 what do you make of the endangerment finding that
2 greenhouse gases have severe effects at the local level
3 that -- I think the endangerment finding is not before
4 us today. The endangerment finding is that they
5 exacerbate ground-level ozone and smog.

6 MR. KEISLER: Certainly, every effect that
7 any environmental phenomenon has on the planet and on
8 people will at some point be felt in some local area.
9 Our point is that that is not the kind of measurable
10 area-specific, regionally-defined air quality impact
11 that the PSD statute --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's certainly not
13 measurable. The agency doesn't even assert that it's
14 measurable, right?

15 MR. KEISLER: That's right. And -- and
16 maybe it would help if I specifically identified. There
17 are three features of the PSD --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. Before
19 you do that, we have an outstanding question from
20 Justice Sotomayor. Maybe --

21 MR. KEISLER: Thank you very much, Mr.
22 Chief Justice.

23 The problem is not simply that the agency
24 rewrote the thresholds and said that it will eventually
25 try, as it did say, to get down to the level of the

1 statutory thresholds, because the reason that Congress
2 wrote those thresholds was because it wanted to exempt
3 small entities from the costs and burdens of the
4 permitting process. And so when EPA says that it hopes
5 eventually to get down to the apartment buildings and
6 large high schools that would be covered if those
7 thresholds were applied to carbon dioxide, it is
8 contravening congressional intent in another way.

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I didn't read them as
10 saying that anyway. I read them as saying they'll try
11 to do it, but make whatever exemptions are necessary.

12 MR. KEISLER: Well, and the problem is,
13 Justice Scalia, that those exemptions violate the
14 statute as well. The exemptions they're talking about
15 in order to deal with the small entities that Congress
16 meant to exclude would be to have general permits by
17 category. And the statute specifically says that these
18 determinations are to be case by case followed by an
19 individualized hearing. And so --

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: It -- it clearly is not a
21 matter of the EPA simply saying we can't do it right
22 away, but we're going to do it eventually.

23 MR. KEISLER: That's right.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: It hasn't said that.

25 MR. KEISLER: It hasn't, and if they did say

1 that they would be violating the statute in worse ways.
2 They would be treating a command by Congress not to
3 regulate small entities into a command to regulate small
4 entities.

5 JUSTICE ALITO: Mr. Keisler, do you really
6 mean to say that the only difference between greenhouse
7 gases and the air pollutants that Congress clearly had
8 in mind when it enacted the Clean Air Act is that
9 greenhouse gases don't have a localized effect? Isn't
10 there also a big difference in that the quantity of
11 greenhouse gases that are emitted by sources are much
12 greater than the quantity of these other pollutants and
13 that's why there's this discrepancy between the
14 statutory threshold and the threshold that EPA has --

15 MR. KEISLER: That's right.

16 JUSTICE ALITO: -- substituted?

17 MR. KEISLER: That's right, Your Honor. And
18 I think there are really two parallel problems that
19 we're dealing with, each of which creates its own need
20 for the EPA to violate the statute in order to save it
21 for greenhouse gases.

22 One is the one that Your Honor and Justice
23 Sotomayor were referring to, which is this was a statute
24 designed for case-by-case permitting of a small number
25 of large sources that materially contribute to the

1 problem. And whether you rewrite the thresholds or
2 promise to regulate down to the infinitesimal level, you
3 are violating that aspect of the statute.

4 But the other aspect of the statute, which
5 is equally violated here, is the requirement that this
6 particular program, not the other programs in the Act,
7 but this particular program, be focused on these
8 area-specific air quality impacts. And there are three
9 features, the three central features of the PSD statute,
10 which we think show that.

11 The first is Section 7471, which is, I
12 think, on page 13A of the appendix to the government's
13 brief. And that is the provision that specifies what
14 the PSD program applies to and also explains what PSD,
15 "prevention of significant deterioration," refers to.
16 And 7471 says, "The program consists of emissions
17 limitations and other measures as may be necessary to
18 prevent significant deterioration of air quality in each
19 region that bears certain designations." And "air
20 quality in each region" is Clean Air Act language for
21 that subset of air pollution problems that have
22 regionally-defined effects on the air that people
23 breathe.

24 JUSTICE BREYER: How does the -- this
25 differ? I mean, there are many statutes, I believe,

1 particularly in the regulatory area, where Congress
2 passes a statute that tells the agency, do A, B, C and
3 D. And then it turns out, since there's so many of the
4 regulated things, that it just doesn't make sense to
5 apply A, B and C and D to all of them. So often I would
6 think courts read in an exception where it makes no
7 sense.

8 For example, if there were a statute that
9 said you have to throw out all bubble gum that's been
10 around for more than a month. Well, what about bubble
11 gum used in a display case that nobody ever intends to
12 eat? You see. And so what we do all the time is we
13 say, well, it doesn't mean to apply to that. Now, why
14 can't we take the same approach or EPA takes the same
15 approach here? It says 250 tons or more and we apply
16 that all over the place, except it doesn't make sense
17 here, so we read an exception into it, unwritten, for
18 places where it makes no sense?

19 MR. KEISLER: I don't know that there
20 actually is a precedent of this Court which says the
21 agency can do precisely what it did here, which is take
22 an express command that identifies thresholds, that
23 didn't delegate to the agency the determination of the
24 thresholds but says --

25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But I'm -- but I'm a

1 little confused, because there have to be pollutants
2 who -- where it doesn't emit just 250, where it emits a
3 million. And the Best Available Control Technology
4 won't get it down to below 250. Yet the PSD program is
5 in effect when they get down below 250 on any pollutant
6 of the six criteria. So it can't be your view that this
7 statute was written only to -- to get to measurable
8 pollutants that -- that are at 250 or -- or can be
9 brought below 250.

10 MR. KEISLER: Well, that's right, Your
11 Honor. It's not our position that the purpose of Best
12 Available Control Technology is to bring facilities down
13 to below the 250 level. It's our position that the
14 statute sets that 250 ton per year level as the trigger,
15 that a facility which emits or has a potential to emit
16 that or more is subject --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's a minimum, but
18 anything --

19 MR. KEISLER: That's right.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- above it.

21 MR. KEISLER: That's right. Anything above
22 it.

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So --

24 MR. KEISLER: And then -- and then best
25 available --

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so GHG is something
2 that's above that and it's never going to be brought
3 down below it.

4 MR. KEISLER: That's right. But it's above
5 it for millions of entities that Congress intended to
6 exempt from the permitting process. And if I could just
7 continue --

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right. Well, let's
9 go --

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Keisler, if I could
11 follow up, really, on Justice Breyer's question, because
12 the conundrum here, you keep saying: Look, EPA is
13 violating this specific statutory term. But the
14 conundrum that this cases raises is that everybody is
15 violating a statutory term. EPA is saying, no, we can't
16 do the 100 to 250 with respect to greenhouse gases, but
17 you are also violating a statutory term. You know, it
18 says any pollutant or it says in the other provision
19 each pollutant subject to regulation. Nobody would
20 think that the most natural, most reasonable readings of
21 those phrases are any pollutant if they have localized
22 effects, but not otherwise.

23 So I mean, what's happened here is that you
24 have this new kind of emission that basically makes
25 these two terms of the statute irreconcilable, and the

1 agency has essentially picked one. It said: Look,
2 we're not going to just exempt a broad class of
3 pollutants. Instead, we're going to fudge the numbers.
4 And why isn't that the more reasonable of the two things
5 to do?

6 MR. KEISLER: Because we don't agree, Your
7 Honor, that those two -- that those two horns of the
8 dilemma that Your Honor described are equally situated.
9 Certainly, 100 and 250 tons per year is a clear and
10 unambiguous congressional command. The question of how
11 to interpret the phrase "air pollutant" is -- that is an
12 issue that is subject to interpretation. And if I could
13 just then follow up --

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I think I don't really
15 understand then. But I mean, it's true that one is a
16 number. But the other, each pollutant subject to
17 regulation or any air pollutant, what the EPA has done
18 is for 30 years across presidential administrations
19 treated those phrases as meaning a single thing, which I
20 think if you put aside the absurdity problem in this
21 case, everybody would agree is the most reasonable
22 interpretation of those phrases. And you're saying the
23 EPA should junk that most reasonable interpretation of
24 those phrases because there's a new kind of emitted --
25 emitted chemical or whatever that makes the numbers not

1 work.

2 MR. KEISLER: No. Let me -- it goes much
3 beyond the numbers, Justice Kagan. I think if anybody
4 were looking at the PSD statute in isolation, without
5 the benefit of Massachusetts v. EPA, assume that the
6 word "pollutant" was an undefined term and the question
7 was, what pollutants does this provision of the Clean
8 Act refer to, they would conclude that it refers to
9 pollutants only that have those area-specific air
10 quality impacts. And it's not only that the prevention
11 of significant deterioration referred to in the statute
12 is the deterioration of air quality in each region. It
13 is also two other features of that statute which we
14 think make that unambiguously clear.

15 The first is Section 7475(e), which can be
16 found on pages 27A to 29A, I think, of the government's
17 statutory appendix. And that mandates the one analysis
18 that has to be conducted in every permitting process and
19 the one analysis that Congress has required be available
20 for public hearing, and that is an analysis of the air
21 quality and local conditions at the site of the facility
22 and each area that is going to be affected by
23 the emissions.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, you began
25 that discussion by saying putting Massachusetts v. EPA

1 to one side. But I was in the dissent in that case, but
2 we still can't do that.

3 MR. KEISLER: No, that's --

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. KEISLER: That's -- that's right, Your
6 Honor.

7 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And -- and my question is
8 along that exact same line. Let's assume, and it's the
9 case, that we're bound by both the result and the
10 reasoning of Massachusetts and EPA and the -- the
11 American Electric v. Connecticut case. Under your view,
12 what regulatory force, what regulatory significance, do
13 those cases have under, A, your approach and, B, the
14 approach by the Chamber of Commerce in the blue brief?
15 I -- I think that may be consistent with the subject the
16 Chief Justice just opened.

17 MR. KEISLER: Sure. Let me begin with
18 Massachusetts v. EPA and then I'll turn to AEP v.
19 Connecticut. Massachusetts v. EPA did not hold that the
20 interpretation of pollutant in that opinion had to be
21 applied every time the word "pollutant" appears in the
22 Clean Air Act. The same day that Massachusetts came
23 out, this Court decided Environmental Defense v. Duke,
24 in which it specifically said that, even when a defined
25 term in the statutory definition provision is construed

1 a particular way, that doesn't mean that that same term
2 used elsewhere in the statute can't be construed
3 differently where context requires. And the Court
4 reversed the Fourth Circuit for holding that they had to
5 be the same.

6 And that's why in Massachusetts, after
7 indeed holding that the definition of "pollutant"
8 unambiguously in its literal sense included greenhouse
9 gases, the Court didn't stop there. It went on to ask
10 whether applying that definition to the Title II
11 provisions on motor vehicles that were at issue in that
12 case would produce what the Court called "extreme
13 measures or counterintuitive results." And only after
14 finding that there'd be no extreme or counterintuitive
15 results did the Court direct the EPA to apply that
16 definition to those Title II provisions.

17 And I think what that reflected was that the
18 Court understood that the literal definition of
19 "pollutant" was sufficiently broad that it shouldn't be
20 mechanically applied, plugged in everywhere in the Act
21 that the word "pollutant" appears, without some
22 additional analysis of the context of those provisions.

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What else does it cover
24 other than Title II, other than mobile vehicles?

25 MR. KEISLER: There are multiple places in

1 which the word "pollutant" appears in the Act in which
2 the EPA has understood Mass v. EPA the way I just
3 described, in which they have interpreted the words "any
4 air pollutant" to mean only a subset of the pollutants
5 that -- that the definition literally could be held to
6 encompass.

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's generally because
8 the section that it's in gives a different definition
9 directly.

10 MR. KEISLER: No, that's -- with respect,
11 Your Honor, that's not correct. So, for example, in the
12 PSD in Title V provisions, it says "any air pollutant."
13 The EPA has interpreted that to mean any regulated air
14 pollutant, not because of any separate definition, but
15 because of context.

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You are right, but --

17 MR. KEISLER: The context suggests
18 otherwise. The same thing with the provision on
19 visibility-impairing pollutants.

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But your -- your answer is
21 that they can be treated differently under different
22 parts of the Act. Doesn't that contradict your earlier
23 view that we can't change the statute?

24 MR. KEISLER: No, I don't think so, Your
25 Honor, because it was an act of interpretation in

1 Massachusetts v. EPA of a particular term, and the
2 question is, reading that decision as a whole, what
3 import did the Court give that interpretation. It would
4 not have needed to go on and say, let's look at
5 specifically the Title II provisions at issue here and
6 ask whether it will produce extreme or counterintuitive
7 measures if it weren't the case that that was an
8 additional part of the inquiry that was necessary.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And what other programs
10 I asked earlier. So we have the mobile vehicles. What
11 else? You're saying it excludes PSD. What else does
12 it --

13 MR. KEISLER: I think most critically, Your
14 Honor, it includes the new source performance standards
15 program of Section 111 that this Court discussed in
16 Connecticut v. AEP. And this is a very important point,
17 because this case is not about whether EPA can regulate
18 greenhouse gases from stationary sources. This Court
19 held that it could under this program in Section 11.

20 This is about whether State and local
21 permitting authorities, the 90-plus State and local
22 permitting authorities, are supposed to regulate plant
23 by plant under this particular PSD program. And I
24 mention the NSPS program because the features of that
25 program highlight what's wrong here because the NSPS

1 program doesn't contain the elements of the PSD program
2 that require the PSD program to be rewritten in so many
3 particulars to make greenhouse gases fit.

4 NSPS doesn't have the 100- and 250-ton per
5 year thresholds. It lets EPA by notice and comment
6 rulemaking decide what category of sources are most
7 contributing to the problem and most require regulation.
8 It doesn't require the area-specific local impact
9 analysis of subsection (e) of 7475, which EPA has told
10 State and local permitting authorities, even though it's
11 mandatory, don't conduct it because it can't be done for
12 greenhouse gases. NSPS permits the EPA to look at
13 reducing the national footprint without regard to
14 area-specific impacts and it permits the EPA to do this
15 through a national uniform emissions standard that the
16 plants can then determine how best to meet, rather than
17 asking 90 State and local permitting authorities, which
18 is what PSD is about, to decide plant by plant what they
19 think each plant in their jurisdiction should do about
20 global warming.

21 JUSTICE BREYER: So in your opinion -- is --
22 I'm not sure what the statutory cite is to the provision
23 you are talking about. Is it 7411?

24 MR. KEISLER: That's right, Your Honor.

25 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So you're

1 saying they could use 7411(a) and (b) to get to just the
2 same place they are today.

3 MR. KEISLER: Yes, without --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: You don't see an objection.
5 There must be some reason they didn't do that.

6 MR. KEISLER: Well, they are doing it, Your
7 Honor.

8 JUSTICE BREYER: They are doing it? Well,
9 then I don't know what this case is about. I mean, it's
10 a question of whether they do exactly the same thing
11 under one provision or another provision. You agree
12 with them that they could do it under the other one and
13 we'd end up at exactly the same place.

14 MR. KEISLER: But it's not exactly the same
15 thing, Your Honor. And it is the difference between
16 having the EPA, through notice and comment rulemaking,
17 establish a national emissions standards and then the
18 plants can deal with that incentive system in the best
19 way they can and figure out how to meet it, versus this
20 command and control PSD mechanism, where 90-plus State
21 and local permitting authorities are each having to
22 decide on their own what controls they think each plant
23 in their area should engage in in order to deal with
24 global warming. It makes perfect sense to have 90 State
25 and local permitting authorities addressing the

1 area-specific air quality impacts of plants that are
2 built in their States.

3 JUSTICE BREYER: It says "such standards
4 with such modifications as he deems appropriate."
5 That's the language of 7411(b).

6 MR. KEISLER: Right.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. So if this is the
8 right program, why couldn't they copy it word for word
9 into the rules and just put a different section number
10 at the bottom? I know you'd have a preferred way to do
11 it, but if they disagreed with you and they think this
12 is the perfect program, why can't they do it?

13 MR. KEISLER: Because the statutory language
14 and structure of the PSD program does not, we think,
15 encompass these kinds of pollutants that have globally
16 dispersed results and not area-specific impacts. And
17 it's for the reasons that I've indicated. 7411, which
18 says -- sorry. 7471, which says that the prevention of
19 significant deterioration is focused on deterioration of
20 air quality in each region; the study required by
21 7475(e), which is of local conditions; and the fact that
22 this is assigned to 90 State and local permitting
23 authorities.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is that your second point?
25 I've been keeping a list here of points you -- you have

1 not been permitted to get to.

2 (Laughter.)

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: One, you were going to
4 discuss not just the Massachusetts case, but the
5 follow-on case to Massachusetts.

6 MR. KEISLER: Oh, well, Connecticut.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: You never did that, yes.

8 MR. KEISLER: Well, Connecticut v. AEP, and
9 the only point to make about that is that that was the
10 case which held that the commission -- that the EPA has
11 authority under Section 111, the NSPS provision, to
12 address greenhouse gases without having to rewrite
13 thresholds by designating the categories of sources like
14 it's trying to do here. But it has to do it by national
15 emissions standards through notice and comment
16 rulemaking. Connecticut v. AEP certainly did not
17 approve -- the PSD provisions here -- certainly did not
18 approve the regulations rewriting the statutory
19 thresholds that the EPA had to -- had to promulgate in
20 this case.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: The other thing -- you were
22 going to give two points and you only got to -- what is
23 it -- 7411(e), but there was another point.

24 MR. KEISLER: There were really -- yes,
25 there were three features I mentioned of the PSD statute

1 which we think make the context clear.

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: You got the first, which
3 was the --

4 MR. KEISLER: Which was 7471, prevention of
5 significant deterioration.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Right.

7 MR. KEISLER: The second was that study, the
8 only required study is of local conditions and
9 area-specific impacts. And the third is just that this
10 is assigned to 90 State and local permitting
11 authorities, which is -- it is not plausible to think
12 that with respect, not to these area-specific impacts,
13 but to a global problem like global warming that what
14 Congress was doing was saying we think 90 State and
15 local permitting authorities should make those decisions
16 rather than, perhaps, EPA on a national basis.

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You -- just to be clear,
18 your reading would say that the -- that the agency was
19 not permitted, with notice and opportunity to be heard,
20 to say -- to make a -- make this a criteria of pollution
21 in NAAQS.

22 MR. KEISLER: If the agency had tried to
23 establish a NAAQS for greenhouse gases, we think that
24 would be contrary to the statute because the National
25 Ambient Air Quality Standards are all about regional

1 concentrations. Is this area in or out of compliance?
2 If the gas goes up to the atmosphere and is mixed there,
3 either the whole country is going to be in attainment or
4 the whole country is going to be out of attainment. It
5 doesn't work at all with the NAAQS structure.

6 And if I could reserve the ---

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, why don't you
8 take an extra 5 minutes, and -- and you can begin by
9 answering the question: You know, the government
10 disaggregates the discussion, and their first point in
11 their brief is that greenhouse gases can be regulated
12 with respect to sources that are already covered by the
13 PSD program. That position does not implicate your
14 concern about the broad reach of EPA regulation, does
15 it?

16 MR. KEISLER: I think it does, Your Honor,
17 because while that might deal with the specific issue of
18 rewriting the thresholds, the fact that the PSD
19 provisions for the reasons I have indicated is limited
20 to area-specific air impacts would we think be violated
21 merely by applying best available control technology to
22 a globally disbursed substance like greenhouse gases.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I understand. But
24 they would only be applying that with respect to sources
25 that are already required to operate under PSD permits.

1 MR. KEISLER: That's right, but they would
2 be applying it to a substance, greenhouse gases, which
3 the PSD program was not designed to address, which was
4 designed to be addressed by other programs. And I would
5 say, Your Honor, that while they have tried to separate
6 those issues out, that there's one issue about who has
7 to get a permit and the other issue about whether the
8 requirements of best available control technology apply,
9 the regulation that they have adopted to implement what
10 they call their tailoring rule applies equally to both.
11 What they've done is say that the words "subject to
12 regulation," which are the words in the BACT provision,
13 shall only apply to greenhouse gases, even when they are
14 regulated, if you're emitting them at levels of 100,000
15 tons per year or more.

16 When they did that they both rewrote the
17 provision that says who has to get a permit and they
18 rewrote the provision that says what best available
19 control technology applies. They did both at once even
20 though their brief treats it as separate.

21 And if -- I'm not certain how much time I
22 have, Mr. Chief Justice. If I have --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You have three and a
24 half minutes left.

25 MR. KEISLER: Not including rebuttal?

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No. You will get 5
2 minutes of rebuttal.

3 MR. KEISLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 If I could then turn briefly to the second
5 argument that I made reference to at the very beginning,
6 which is an argument that need not be addressed if the
7 Court is persuaded by what I've just said. But if not,
8 we have a second, narrower argument which is in the
9 American Chemistry Council brief, which addresses the
10 requirements for triggering the PSD statute, and our
11 position on that is very much like Judge Kavanaugh's
12 position below, which is that the statute is triggered
13 only by emissions of major amounts of a pollutant for
14 which the area is in attainment.

15 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but that's not Judge
16 Kavanaugh's position. I thought Judge Kavanaugh's
17 position is any NAAQS pollutant, all NAAQS pollutants.

18 MR. KEISLER: That's right, Your Honor, and
19 that is a distinction. Our position is similar but not
20 identical to his position.

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: And it comes from a
22 different portion of the statutory language.

23 MR. KEISLER: That's right. We are focused
24 on language in any area to which this part applies, and
25 that is because Part C, the PSD provision, applies not

1 to an area as a whole, but for some pollutants and not
2 for others in any particular area.

3 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can I ask, Mr. Kavanaugh,
4 why Judge Kavanaugh's argument has been left by the
5 wayside?

6 MR. KEISLER: It is very similar, Your
7 Honor, to the argument that we're making, but we get at
8 it in a different way and with a slightly different
9 result.

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it does -- it comes
11 from different statutory language. His arguments about
12 the structure of the statute don't apply to your
13 argument. So I think, notwithstanding that there is
14 some overlap between the arguments, the legal rationales
15 are entirely different, and I guess I'm just curious.

16 MR. KEISLER: This is the argument we made
17 below and it's the argument we've continued to make
18 here. And the point of the argument.

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I don't think that
20 answers the question.

21 MR. KEISLER: Excuse me, Your Honor?

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I said I don't think --
23 I don't think it answers the question, which is I know
24 that's the argument; are you saying you can't defend his
25 argument or are you saying that --

1 MR. KEISLER: No, it's just that it's been
2 hard enough to make two alternative arguments in this
3 forum and to add a third to it would be more than I
4 think I could handle.

5 (Laughter.)

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Can you clarify that? We
7 have the NAAQS criteria. EPA has added many others
8 across the years. For 30 years it's been adding things
9 for which there are no NAAQS. What about all of those?

10 MR. KEISLER: Your Honor, it is true that
11 ever since 1980 -- although it proposed our
12 interpretation as its original interpretation of the
13 statute, ever since 1980 EPA has said that any
14 pollutant, whether it's a NAAQS pollutant, whether it's
15 a pollutant for which the area is in attainment, any
16 pollutant would be sufficient to trigger PSD permit
17 requirements. But that has had virtually no practical
18 effect because all of those other pollutants, if they
19 are emitted in threshold quantities, invariably -- we've
20 been able to find about two or three exceptions over 30
21 years -- invariably the facility that is emitting them
22 is also emitting 250 tons per year of one of the
23 criteria pollutants.

24 So this was a difference which made no
25 difference until greenhouse gases came onto the scene.

1 And with the Court's permission, I will
2 reserve the remainder of my time.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
4 General Mitchell.

5 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JONATHAN F. MITCHELL
6 ON BEHALF OF STATE PETITIONERS

7 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
8 please the Court:

9 There of are at least two issues in this
10 case in which EPA and the Petitioners agree. The first
11 is that the term "air pollutant" cannot be given a
12 uniform construction after the Clean Air Act even after
13 this Court's ruling in Massachusetts that "air
14 pollutant" includes all things airborne for purposes of
15 Title 2. The second point of agreement is that
16 greenhouse gases cannot be treated the same as other air
17 pollutants for purposes of the PSD and Title 5 programs,
18 because the unambiguous statutory requirements of those
19 programs are incompatible with sensible regulation of
20 greenhouse gases.

21 EPA thinks it can fix this problem by
22 imposing an atextual agency-created regime that applies
23 only to greenhouse gases. The proper response, however,
24 is for EPA to conclude that Congress never delegated
25 regulatory authority over greenhouse gases in the PSD

1 and Title 5 programs. Congress does not establish round
2 holes for square pegs, and Brown & Williamson holds in
3 these situations an agency cannot make a round hole
4 square by rewriting unambiguous statutory language.

5 JUSTICE KAGAN: General, I take it that the
6 unambiguous statutory language that you are referring to
7 is the references to 100 and to 250. And it seems to me
8 that that's an odd kind of term to drive such an
9 important statutory interpretation question, because
10 what those numbers were all about is that they were
11 supposed to separate major emitters from minor emitters.
12 I mean, they were supposed to be about the size of the
13 facility. They were not supposed to have -- they were
14 not supposed to make any distinctions as to the type of
15 pollutant. So you're essentially using those numbers to
16 make distinctions as to the type of pollutant rather
17 than, it seems to me a more sensible approach would be
18 to say, look, the 100 and 250 numbers don't work for
19 this new kind of pollutant, we're going to up the
20 numbers, and that will leave the rest of the statute and
21 all the purposes of Congress intact.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Justice Kagan, the reason we
23 don't think the approach that you describe is
24 permissible is because there are statutory provisions in
25 the Clean Air Act that specifically forbid EPA to do

1 what Your Honor is prescribing. 7661(a)(A) says that
2 EPA cannot under any circumstance exempt any major
3 source from the Title 5 requirements. And because that
4 provision is in the statute, EPA cannot be claiming to
5 seize discretion when Congress has specifically withheld
6 that type of discretion here. This is akin to a
7 dispensing power, for EPA to be coming in and rewriting
8 the Title 5 permitting thresholds in the way that they
9 are.

10 And the question to ask is whether the term
11 "air pollutant" is flexible enough to accommodate
12 different meanings in different statutory contexts. And
13 here even EPA agrees with us that "air pollutant" can
14 mean different things in different parts of the Act,
15 even after Massachusetts.

16 Massachusetts held that "air pollutant"
17 unambiguously includes all things airborne, all airborne
18 compounds of whatever stripe for purposes of Title 2.
19 But EPA has refused to carry over that definition
20 throughout the Clean Air Act when the term "air
21 pollutant" appears in at least three different places.
22 One of them is section 7411(a)(4), which is part of the
23 NSPS program. In that provision the term "air
24 pollutant" appears as part of the definition of
25 modification.

1 EPA does not interpret that to mean all
2 things airborne. It doesn't even interpret it to mean
3 all regulated air pollutants. It interprets that to
4 mean air pollutants for which a standard of performance
5 has been established. In the PSD and Title 5 permitting
6 thresholds, EPA interprets the phrase "any air
7 pollutant" not to mean all things airborne, but to mean
8 any regulated air pollutant.

9 And then finally, in Section 7491 EPA
10 interprets the phrase "any pollutant" to mean any
11 visibility-impairing pollutant. So if Massachusetts's
12 all things airborne view of the phrase "air pollutant" is
13 forced to be applied to every provision of the Clean Air
14 Act where the word "air pollutant" appears, all of these
15 longstanding EPA interpretations would have to be
16 discarded.

17 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, General, if you think
18 about the question of what any pollutant means, and you
19 put aside this whole absurdity question that the numbers
20 get you to, you just say, what does any air pollutant
21 mean? Does it mean what EPA has said it has meant for
22 30 years, which is any pollutant that's regulated under
23 this Act, or does it mean something more along the lines
24 of what you're saying, which is anything other than
25 greenhouse gases or anything other than pollutants that

1 have particular localized effects.

2 You would obviously choose EPA's version of
3 the thing. And the only reason that you're not choosing
4 that is because of these numbers that are in the
5 statute, which were designed only, only to distinguish
6 between major and minor emitters.

7 So if you can distinguish between major and
8 minor emitters while keeping the completely sensible
9 longstanding interpretation of any pollutant, why
10 wouldn't you do that?

11 MR. MITCHELL: Because I don't think it can
12 be said, Justice Kagan, that the phrase "any air
13 pollutant" unambiguously means any regulated pollutant.
14 That is a possible interpretation of air pollutant, but
15 there are others, and EPA has adopted other definitions
16 depending on the surrounding statutory --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Let me ask you a
18 question. Assuming we agree with you, that neither
19 Massachusetts or Alabama -- there's no statutory command
20 to come to EPA's conclusion, what do we do? Do we just
21 reverse them, or do we vacate and remand and tell them,
22 no, you were wrong at step one; there is ambiguity in
23 the statute?

24 MR. MITCHELL: It's more than just that
25 there's ambiguity, Justice Sotomayor. We're asking the

1 Court to hold that a greenhouse gas inclusive
2 interpretation of air pollutant simply does not fit with
3 the unambiguous provisions of the PSD and Title V
4 programs, just as a tobacco inclusive or nicotine
5 inclusive interpretation of the word "drug" was not able
6 to fit with the unambiguous requirement --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: But that's a difficult -- I
8 think where Justice Kagan is going -- and I will if she
9 wasn't, but I think she was -- is put the definition
10 from 7479 in your mind. That means something to you,
11 right? You know what I'm talking about.

12 MR. MITCHELL: The definition of?

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Of the major emitting
14 facility.

15 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Now, we look at
17 7475, and it says you have to have a permit and use best
18 available control technology. For what? And then we go
19 to the definition, and it says, among other things, "For
20 any source with the potential to emit 250 tons per year
21 or more of any pollutant."

22 Now, that doesn't -- my God, that maybe
23 means every 500 people, every school is applied here.
24 So you say we've got to do something about this statute
25 because they don't really mean to every football game

1 they're going to have a permit, or it doesn't mean every
2 500 people, like all of my relatives are together, they
3 have to have a permit. No, it can't mean that.

4 So we have two choices. Choice A, which is
5 what you would like, is it means any air pollutant, any
6 regulated air pollutant, but not greenhouse gases.

7 Okay. That's choice one.

8 Choice two is it means any air pollutant
9 including greenhouse gases, but implicitly EPA has the
10 authority to exempt small emitters. You see?

11 Now, which does the less violence to the
12 statute?

13 MR. MITCHELL: Choice one. And the reason
14 choice one --

15 JUSTICE BREYER: I knew you would say that.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. MITCHELL: The reason choice one does
18 less violence is because the term "air pollutant" is
19 flexible and has been acknowledged to be by EPA for
20 decades, and I think even by this Court, notwithstanding
21 its holding in Massachusetts. It's permissible for an
22 agency to construe ambiguous statutory language to avoid
23 absurdity. In fact, it must construe the ambiguous
24 language to avoid absurdity before taking choice two
25 that Your Honor described, where it rewrites unambiguous

1 statutory language to avoid absurdity.

2 If the simple choice were between construing
3 one unambiguous statutory provision to avoid the
4 anomalous results and construing another unambiguous
5 statutory provision to avoid that outcome, then EPA
6 would have a much stronger case for deference here.

7 The problem for EPA is they've insisted for
8 decades that air pollutant can mean different things in
9 different parts of --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So let me
11 modify my question. I get that answer on the language
12 there. But if you had been sitting in Congress and the
13 Senate, Mr. Billings, I think, is the staff person,
14 Senator Muskie, and suppose that you had this choice put
15 to you with your language. We'd either like to have the
16 authority implicit here to exempt the football team, the
17 tiny emitters, or we'd like it not to cover it at all.

18 Which do you think the Senate would have
19 chosen in enacting this bill from the evidence in the
20 language itself, in the evidence which I look at, the
21 history of the bill?

22 MR. MITCHELL: I think they did make a
23 choice, and it's in the language of the bill, that EPA
24 does not have the authority to exempt any major source
25 from Title V. They say that right there in Section

1 7061(a) (a) on page 44 of the statutory appendix in --

2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Title V is not the PSD
3 requirement. Title V is just the recordkeeping
4 provision.

5 MR. MITCHELL: That's true, but EPA --

6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so why shouldn't we
7 exempt people from Title V? That's not what's causing
8 the burden that you're talking about. It's just a
9 recordkeeping provision.

10 MR. MITCHELL: But it's a -- it's a very
11 burdensome recordkeeping provision as -- as EPA
12 acknowledges. That's why they're not willing to impose
13 it on every entity that emits more than 100 tons per
14 year of carbon dioxide. It costs, on average, \$20,000
15 to get a Title V permit and -- and hundreds of man
16 hours. And it's plausible to impose those burdens,
17 perhaps, on large industrial sources, but certainly not
18 to impose that on the corner deli or -- or the Chinese
19 restaurant of a high school building.

20 So, again, to return to Justice Breyer's
21 question, which would Congress have chosen, the choice
22 was made in the statute to establish rigid numerical
23 permitting thresholds that were defined not only by 100
24 tons and 250 tons per year, but also defined by a
25 specific metric.

1 And to withhold from the agency the
2 discretion to depart from those unambiguous
3 requirements, instead, they provided looseness to the
4 extent they provided it in the definition of air
5 pollutant, which even though this Court held in
6 Massachusetts unambiguously includes all things
7 airborne, for purposes of Title II, EPA has narrowed
8 that construction in numerous other parts of the
9 statute.

10 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. If you can
11 narrow it, why not narrow that one? Any air pollutant,
12 including greenhouse gases, to the extent that they can
13 be sensibly controlled under this statute. Now I've
14 worked with the words "air pollutant." You see, I can
15 do it any way you want if I'm prepared to read in
16 exceptions. And, of course, we do have exceptions when
17 agencies enforce statutes. We do have exceptions from
18 general language all the time.

19 MR. MITCHELL: I don't -- yeah, I don't
20 think it would be a permissible act of statutory
21 construction to say that carbon dioxide could be an air
22 pollutant and not an air pollutant at the same time.

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you -- you'd accept
24 his definition, wouldn't you? You'd be happy with a
25 definition that says air pollutant means any air

1 pollutant to the extent it can be sensibly controlled
2 under the statute. And you would say this one obviously
3 can't.

4 MR. MITCHELL: Right, which means it can't
5 be regulated under the Title V --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: So that would be a
7 wonderful definition.

8 JUSTICE BREYER: It can, though. It can in
9 large quantity -- quantities. I mean, you don't see
10 anything wrong with large quantities. It's just the
11 small quantities you have a problem with.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Well, we have a problem
13 with --

14 JUSTICE BREYER: I mean, are you saying it
15 doesn't make sense to control major emitters of CO2?

16 MR. MITCHELL: We're saying it doesn't make
17 sense to construe air pollutant in a greenhouse
18 gas-inclusive manner for purposes of the PSD program
19 because the unambiguous requirements require the EPA to
20 reach the small emitters. And if EPA wants to fix the
21 problem, they can't resort to this form of agency
22 self-help. They need to get --

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: General, one question is
24 what would Congress have wanted, given the obvious
25 purposes of the Act. And that's an important question.

1 Another question is: What did the agency decide here?
2 I mean, obviously, this is the apex of Chevron
3 deference. There's nothing that gets more deference
4 than this agency with respect to this complicated a
5 statute.

6 And given that this whole thing arises
7 because there's this new kind of emission, which --
8 which the numbers don't work for, but which essentially
9 makes these two terms in the statute irreconcilable, why
10 isn't that a classic case for deference to the agency,
11 that the agency gets to choose how to make the thing
12 work as best it can, when a changed circumstance makes
13 it work not entirely the way Congress had foretold?

14 MR. MITCHELL: I think because the Court
15 rejected that very idea in *Brown & Williamson*, where
16 tobacco was trying to be regulated by FDA under a
17 statute where the word "drug" clearly included nicotine,
18 if you just looked at the definition of "drug" in
19 isolation, but this Court rejected FDA's assertion of
20 jurisdiction by saying that the unambiguous requirements
21 of the Food and Drug Act would be --

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: To accept your -- your
23 argument, we have to reverse *Massachusetts*.

24 MR. MITCHELL: No, not at all, Justice
25 Sotomayor.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, you're saying
2 that the -- that Congress didn't intend to control this
3 pollutant. We said there that it did.

4 MR. MITCHELL: No. The Court only needs to
5 revisit Massachusetts if it believes that air pollutant
6 must have a uniform, unambiguous construction everywhere
7 it appears in the Clean Air Act. And -- and not even
8 EPA is making that assertion to this Court. And we've
9 shown throughout how EPA has interpreted air pollutant
10 differently. So there is no need to visit Massachusetts
11 at all to conclude that at least in the context of the
12 PSD and Title V programs, it's not plausible for the
13 agency to construe the phrase "air pollutant" to include
14 greenhouse gases.

15 If the Court has no further questions, I
16 yield my time back to the Court.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General
18 Mitchell.

19 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GENERAL DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.

20 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: Mr. Chief Justice, and
22 may it please the Court:

23 Greenhouse gases pose the same threat to
24 public health and welfare when they are emitted from a
25 power plant as when they are emitted from the tailpipe

1 of a car; and in American Electric Power this Court said
2 it was plain that EPA has the authority to prescribe
3 general rules limiting greenhouse gas emissions by
4 stationary sources like power plants. Yet Petitioners
5 say EPA lacks any authority to use the PSD permitting
6 program to regulate the same emissions, from the same
7 sources, causing the same harms.

8 That's not a reasonable reading of the
9 statutory text, and it rests on a fundamental
10 misunderstanding of the PSD program and the way it is
11 supposed to operate in conjunction with the --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why? Why would it be
13 unreasonable to give -- give EPA authority to regulate
14 mobile sources and not authority to -- to regulate
15 stationary sources, given that stationary sources have
16 to be licensed in this fashion and it -- it produces all
17 sorts of other problems? That doesn't seem to me
18 irrational at all.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, the Court said, I
20 think, that it was plain that Congress gave EPA the
21 authority to regulate stationary sources in the American
22 Electric Power case under Section 7411, and that I think
23 gets to a fundamental premise where the Petitioners are
24 just wrong.

25 Section 7411 -- and this relates to a

1 question you asked, Justice Breyer -- Section 7411 and
2 the PSD program are not aimed at different problems.
3 They are aimed at the same problem, and you can see that
4 from the statutory text. For example, if one looks at
5 section 7475(a)(3), which you can find at page 21A of
6 our appendix, you will see that in order to become
7 eligible for a PSD permit if you are a major emitting
8 facility, you've got to -- if you are looking at
9 subsection (3), under (3)(A) and (3)(B), you've got to
10 show that you can meet all of the local air quality
11 requirements of the NAAQS, those standards; and then (C)
12 says you've got to meet any other applicable emissions
13 standard or standard of performance under this chapter.
14 And that standard of performance language is not an
15 accident. In 7411 the standards that are set, the
16 nationwide standards that Mr. Keisler was discussing for
17 greenhouse gases or other air pollutants, are called
18 standards of performance. So it's specifically picking
19 up the Section 7411 standard.

20 Then if one turns to the definition of Best
21 Available Control Technology under the PSD program,
22 which you can find at page 34A of the appendix to our
23 brief, you will notice that Congress specifically linked
24 the operation of the Section 7411 standards and the Best
25 Available Control Technology under the PSD program. And

1 what this provision says, I won't belabor you by reading
2 the lengthy provision, but what it says is that once
3 Congress has set a standard under section 7411, a
4 nationwide standard, that becomes a floor for the
5 evaluation of Best Available Control Technology.

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Are you reading subsection
7 (3), the (A), (B) and (C), and you focus on (C), any
8 other applicable -- are you reading those in the
9 alternative? I read that they -- that all three have to
10 be complied with.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, they all three have
12 have to be complied with, yes, Justice --

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But then that doesn't help
14 you, because you are right back to where you started.
15 You have the tonnage per year requirement.

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I would be happy
17 to --

18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And with the absurd result
19 that follows.

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I would be happy to
21 get to that. But if I could just finish off this point
22 about the connection between the operation of the two,
23 because I do think it's of critical importance here.
24 That what you are supposed to do under BACT is use Best
25 Available Control Technology to get above the floor,

1 that the NSPS program sets those standards on an every
2 8-year basis, and the point of BACT is to force best
3 practices to keep raising the bar during those 8-year
4 intervals.

5 And there is an additional point to be made
6 about the relationship between the two. This goes back
7 to Senator Muskie in 1977. The NSPS program was enacted
8 as part of the 1970 Act. The PSD program was added in
9 1977; and it was added in 1977 because of
10 dissatisfaction over both the pace and the
11 comprehensiveness of the -- of air pollutant regulations
12 that were being enacted by EPA under the 7411 standard;
13 and it's because under 7411 EPA has got to go one source
14 category at a time. It has got to do power plants; then
15 it's got to do refineries; then it's got to do the next
16 thing and the next thing and the next thing. And so EPA
17 hadn't gotten standards in place for all the different
18 sources, and the point of -- of the PSD program is to
19 put in place an additional requirement. It's exactly
20 what Congress was after. So that when there is a
21 standard under 7411 that becomes the floor, and you --
22 and BACT says let's keep raising the bar. But when
23 there isn't a standard under 7411 PSD is supposed to
24 fill the breach, and it makes sense because you want to
25 get -- the PSD program, remember, applies to -- excuse

1 me -- it applies to new construction or major
2 modification. The idea behind it is you want to get in
3 there at the beginning when the source is first being
4 constructed, so that they don't lock in old pollutant --
5 pollution-causing technology. They have got to meet
6 Best Available Control Technology.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: About the Best
8 Available Control Technology, I think I have an idea of
9 what that looks like with respect to sources already
10 regulated, because they're relating to the NAAQS. You
11 know, filters, scrubbers and all that; I'm sure it's
12 oversimplified. But what does Best Available Control
13 Technology look like with respect to greenhouse gases?

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, it's an evolving
15 process, Your Honor, and there are now 140 or so permits
16 that have been issued applying BACT to greenhouse gas
17 emissions. There is some very helpful discussion of
18 this kind of specifics in two places: The State
19 Respondents' brief, pages 35 to 39, and the Calpine
20 amicus brief. Calpine is a major utility, regulated --

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. But am I --
22 am I right because the greenhouse gases do not affect
23 ambient air quality in a way that the current or the
24 NAAQS provisions do? I mean, you're dealing with
25 regulation of energy usage, right, as opposed to

1 emissions of lead, emissions of the other NAAQS
2 provisions?

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well it's -- one
4 thing we're doing -- the main thing now is significant
5 energy efficiency, for example, different kinds of
6 turbines; different kinds of processes, that sort of --
7 that sort of thing. That's right.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The same sort of
9 thing as with, for domestic uses, as the energy
10 efficient light bulbs?

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I really don't
12 think this is about light bulbs, Mr. Chief Justice.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, but my point is
14 it relates to energy consumption as opposed to
15 particulate emission.

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: At the -- at the moment
17 that's largely true, not entirely true; there are some
18 other technologies described. But of course the EPA is
19 considering and scientists are trying to develop
20 additional control technologies like carbon capture
21 technologies; and that's the whole point of Best
22 Available Control Technology, is as technology advances
23 and better options come on line, that allow for even
24 greater control of the pollutants, the statute requires
25 that they be incorporated. That's how it's supposed to

1 work.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If you -- if you
3 regulate -- I'm talking about your two distinct
4 arguments in your -- in your brief. If you prevail on
5 the first: In other words, greenhouse gases may be
6 regulated with respect to sources that are already
7 subject to permitting, my understanding, it gets you to
8 83 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions.

9 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Prevailing on the
11 second argument gets you to 86 percent.

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So this is a
14 fight -- putting aside your first argument -- about an
15 additional 3 percent, and yet according to the
16 Petitioners that brings in this huge regulatory problem,
17 of, you know, regulating the high school football game
18 and -- and what-not.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: Right. Just an aside on
20 the high school football game. Human beings are
21 actually net neutral on carbon emissions, and you will
22 need a chemist to explain that to you. But it doesn't
23 matter how many families members you have; you won't get
24 to the limit. But with respect to the -- with respect
25 to the question --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The lights at the
2 game.

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: The lights at the game I
4 don't think would be a problem, either. But anyway
5 there obviously is -- and EPA has acknowledged that
6 there is -- a significant expansion of the permitting
7 obligation under EPA's present understanding of
8 permitting. But let me try to take this in two pieces
9 if I could.

10 Let me first talk about why it's not just
11 about the 3 percent, and then let me try to get back to
12 Justice Kennedy's question to talk about the expansion
13 of the permitting obligation and what EPA is actually
14 thinking and doing about that. The problem here is that
15 the options -- one of the problems, significant problem
16 is that the options that the -- the American Chemistry
17 Council have advanced and even that Judge Kavanaugh has
18 advanced would require an invalidation of or at least a
19 significant, a significant revision of EPA's 34-year
20 understanding of the meaning of the phrase "any air
21 "pollutant" in 7479(1), which they have always
22 interpreted to mean any -- any air pollutant subject to
23 regulation under the Act. That -- you can't apply that
24 34-year-long agency interpretation here and get to one
25 of those results. You've got to -- you've got to change

1 it.

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, but the 34-year agency
3 interpretation is not a statute.

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, it's not, Justice
5 Scalia, of course.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: And you are -- you know,
7 you are saying oh, rather than alter our 34-year
8 interpretation, we're -- we're going to revise the
9 provisions of the statute. I don't think that's a --
10 that's a good trade.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I -- with all due
12 respect, I don't think that's what the agency is doing
13 and if I may, just, let me if I could just sort of
14 finish off this. The problem is that if you take the --
15 if you draw the line either at NAAQS pollutants versus
16 all other previously regulated pollutants, or if you
17 draw the line at local pollutants but not global
18 pollutants, you are going to knock out some sources that
19 have been subjected to the permitting requirement
20 previously.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: Can I ask you this question
22 about -- can I ask you this question about EPA's
23 position? Because this is something I don't understand.
24 On the one hand, EPA says that applying the statutory
25 thresholds to greenhouse gases would transform the PSD

1 program into something that would be unrecognizable to
2 the Congress that enacted the program; isn't that right?

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, they did say that.

4 JUSTICE ALITO: On the other hand, EPA says,
5 but that's what we're going to aim to achieve at some
6 point down the road.

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, that's a fundamental
8 misconception, Justice Alito, and I would like to try to
9 clear it up and it goes to -- I'll try to answer Your
10 Honor's question as well, Justice Scalia.

11 What EPA's doing here is saying this is a
12 transition, it's not a rewrite. And the goal of the
13 transition is not to gradually expand the permitting
14 requirement until they've got all the Dunkin' Donuts in
15 America under it. That's not what's going on. In fact,
16 it's the opposite. What they're saying is, they're
17 taking a look at the standards they used to decide who's
18 eligible for a permit. They're looking to change those,
19 to the extent they can, consistent with their statutory
20 authority and appropriate Chevron deference, to
21 substantially narrow the numbers of people who will be
22 deemed eligible. And that's in particular --

23 JUSTICE ALITO: And then they're never going
24 to get to the statutory thresholds. I thought EPA said
25 well, we're going to work toward that.

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, this is -- this is to
2 try to get to the statutory threshold. Well, let me
3 give you an example of the main -- one of the main ways
4 --

5 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, that's -- then I don't
6 understand the position. If -- if applying the
7 statutory thresholds makes the program unrecognizable,
8 and yet that's what they're going to aim to do down the
9 road, get to -- get to the statutory thresholds, will it
10 become more recognizable at that point?

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Under the point -- the
12 nuance there, that I think answers Your Honor's
13 question, is that there -- the agency has discretion in
14 deciding what constitutes the potential to emit 250 tons
15 per year. What they have done historically is evaluate
16 that on the basis of an assumption that it's facilities
17 operating 24 hours a day --

18 JUSTICE BREYER: But then they'll -- then
19 they'll be back down to -- to 41,000 people fully within
20 this. And when you get to Number 5, Title V, 6.1
21 million, that sort of changes what -- I mean, if that's
22 the question, does, in fact, this provision give the EPA
23 the -- the obligation to impose permit requirements on
24 41,000 businesses of a size that really are --
25 constitute, at most, 10 or 15 percent of the problem,

1 well, that's -- that's pretty hard to accept.

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: What I thought the question
4 was, was whether EPA had the authority to implement this
5 in a way that EPA itself thinks make sense, which might
6 be, on their own reasoning, to not impose permitting
7 requirements on tens of thousands, perhaps millions of
8 small businesses. I thought that was what the question
9 was. That did seem to be the way they put it.

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: It is. But I think the
11 two things converge, Justice Breyer. They're trying to
12 get to the point of saying that you won't have to apply
13 -- if you apply the standards EPA uses now, you sweep in
14 all these people, and EPA says, well --

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Are they going to get some
16 new standards? But are these -- but the words they used
17 in their opinion were streamlining.

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: Right.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: The words they used in
20 their opinion implied to me when I read them that
21 they're never going to want to put tiny boilers under
22 this because it just doesn't do very much good and it's
23 expensive to administer. That's how I read it.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct.

25 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Then my

1 question is back, because you've been -- this has been
2 very helpful. I learned I'm not a net emitter of carbon
3 dioxide. Believe me, because that means I'm a part of
4 sustainable development. I thought --

5 (Laughter.)

6 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So I learned
7 quite a lot from this and I'd like to learn one more
8 thing, which is, look, 7411, remember what the Chief
9 Justice just said about the 83 percent and the 86
10 percent. And even if you lose, they still can regulate
11 83 percent and if you win, you can regulate 86 percent.
12 And, my goodness, if 7411 is over there letting them do
13 precisely what they want, why do you need this, too?
14 That's the part that I haven't got a clear answer to in
15 my mind.

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: So the -- it's the reason
17 I tried to suggest earlier, Justice Breyer, that the PSD
18 program is supposed to work as a complement together
19 with 7411. For example, if 7411 now is being used, at
20 least EPA's contemplating setting standards, greenhouse
21 gas emission standards for power plants. That's a very
22 significant contributor of greenhouse gases, but it's
23 not the only one. There are refineries, there are other
24 major sources --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, put those all in.

1 Put those all in. Write -- write complicated standards.
2 Write standards that have certain enforcement capacities
3 and abilities. Write standards that require you to get
4 a PSD permit. I mean, what's wrong with all that?

5 GENERAL VERRILLI: They can do all of that,
6 but the -- but the problem is that that's going to take
7 a lot of time, and that was the very reason Congress put
8 the PSD program into existence in 1977 was because of
9 the dissatisfaction because of the time it took to go
10 source by source, pollutant by pollutant under the EPA's
11 7411 program.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. I just want
13 to make sure that I understood correctly.

14 Under 7411, you can require a PSD --

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, you can set a
16 national standard.

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right.

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: But part of the reason,
19 as I said, I think it's just wrong to think about the
20 PSD program as being -- addressing a different kind of
21 problem from the 7411 problem is that you've got to meet
22 the 7411 standard in your PSD application.

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: General -- general, if I
24 could actually get back to Justice Alito's question,
25 because I had a similar issue with what EPA did here.

1 It seems to me it would be completely responsible and
2 understandable if EPA had said, look, the 100 and 250
3 don't work with respect to this category of pollutant,
4 Congress didn't know that this kind of pollutant was out
5 there when it wrote those numbers, what it was trying to
6 do was to distinguish between major and minor emitters,
7 the new numbers are X and Y for that -- for this kind of
8 pollutant. But, you know, and I understand that EPA may
9 have felt like, oh, gosh, can we really do that? But
10 the solution that EPA came up with actually seems to
11 give it complete discretion to do whatever it wants,
12 whenever it wants to, and to not -- and to be much more
13 problematic than if EPA had just said, no, it's not 100
14 and 250. It's 10 times that.

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: I take that point, Your
16 Honor. I don't actually think that's what EPA was
17 trying to do. I know it's been portrayed that way. I
18 think that they were trying to do the opposite. They
19 were trying to say, well, let's look at how we define
20 what it means to emit 250 tons per year and see if we
21 can make that a more realistic analysis by going from
22 the 24/7, 365-day-a-year hypothesis to figuring out how
23 much this source is actually likely to emit, and you
24 could drastically lower the number of sources who would
25 be found to emit 250 tons per year, and that would bring

1 -- it would try to bring the system into line with the
2 expectations that major emitters would be regulating.
3 That -- that's their objective here.

4 JUSTICE ALITO: Are greenhouse gases the
5 only air pollutant for which EPA has the authority to
6 change the statutory thresholds?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I'd like to make a
8 point, if I could, about that. The real problem here is
9 CO2. Actually, of the other -- of the six greenhouse
10 gases, the other five you could use the statutory
11 thresholds on without difficulty. It's the CO2 alone
12 really that causes a difficulty.

13 JUSTICE ALITO: But could it do -- could it
14 do this for another pollutant, something other than any
15 of the greenhouse gases?

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think, in
17 fairness, what EPA is saying here is that we've got an
18 obligation under the statute to regulate. We've got an
19 obligation to require a permit when there's more than
20 250 tons per year, and we've got an obligation to get
21 the permits out within a year. That's also a statutory
22 requirement. And that just given the reality of the CO2
23 emission, something's got to give. So I don't think
24 it's that they're asserting authority to rewrite the
25 statutory thresholds. They're dealing with a practical

1 problem that's arisen under the immediate circumstances.

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One of the things that
3 EPA said in -- in the explanation of this rule is that
4 EPA could say that PSD or Title V applies only to
5 certain GHG sources -- it's been suggested that that's
6 also the carbon dioxide -- applies only to certain GHG
7 sources and does not apply to the remaining GHG sources.
8 But there didn't seem to be any follow-up of that idea.
9 Well, the way to cure it is carbon dioxide doesn't work,
10 take it out.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: But I think the reason,
12 Justice Ginsburg, is because that is not going to
13 make -- the carbon dioxide is also a huge part of the
14 problem, and so you're really not going to be getting to
15 the heart of the problem. And there really is an
16 urgency here, you know, that's part of what's driving
17 EPA in this situation, of course, is understanding that
18 this is an urgent environmental problem. It's the -- it
19 is the gravest environmental problem that we face now as
20 far as EPA and EPA's judgment, and it is one that gets
21 worse with the passage of time. The effects are
22 cumulative and they're delayed, and so every year we
23 wait, we make the hole deeper and we create an even
24 greater threat to future generations. And that really
25 goes to --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. I didn't
2 get an answer to -- hear an answer to Justice Alito's
3 question and I think it's an important one. There are
4 currently criteria pollutants under the -- under the
5 Act. Let's assume you find out that there's a
6 particular substance that does cause harm to ambient air
7 quality that is not already covered, and you publish a
8 NAAQS for that, can you decide that 100 and 250, you
9 want to regulate at a different threshold, just like you
10 have here. I mean, is this a particular assertion of
11 authority only with respect to greenhouse gases or does
12 it cover any pollutant under the Act?

13 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, if you're -- if
14 you're going to use the NAAQS approach and designate it
15 as a NAAQ, as a NAAQS pollutant, then you would be under
16 the rules of NAAQS pollutant and pollutants, and that
17 would include this standard. But this is --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Can you publish a
19 NAAQ for greenhouse gases?

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think it would be
21 within EPA's authority to do so, but there are really
22 significant problems with trying to regulate that way,
23 and that's why -- but -- and -- but it's important to
24 understand, Mr. Chief Justice, that the PSD program
25 applies to more than just NAAQS pollutants. It's --

1 it's any pollutant subject to regulation under the Act.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Let's pick --
3 there is a pollutant that isn't currently regulated, and
4 science advances to the point where you think it should
5 be regulated. Can you change the 100 and 250 thresholds
6 for that new covered pollutant?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: I guess what I would say
8 about that is that if EPA found itself in exactly the
9 same circumstances it finds itself in with respect to
10 greenhouse gases, where it's -- it feels like the
11 statutory definition compels it to regulate, it kicks in
12 at 250, and you've got to issue a permit in a year, that
13 they could make a judgment comparable to the one they
14 made here. But it's -- that would require that
15 confluence of circumstances to arise.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: But why? Why does it have
17 to do that? Statutes all the time have implicit
18 exceptions, and not every statute has such exceptions
19 written in words into it. I mean -- you know, it's
20 classic example, one after another. A statute that
21 requires animals to pay 50 percent on the train does not
22 apply to snails. Okay. I mean that's the most common
23 thing in law.

24 So what's the big problem here that
25 everybody seems to have, except me, just about? I mean,

1 what's the big problem with writing an implicit
2 exception so that you don't regulate tiny little things
3 which no one normally wants to have regulated?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: If the Court were to do
5 that, that would certainly justify the EPA's judgement
6 --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: And now, my problem is I
8 will hear from many that what I would -- perhaps it
9 isn't a question of what I'd like to do. The question
10 is, what does the law permit? And therefore, it's
11 helpful if you can or others think of similar examples.

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, EPA has committed
13 itself in this -- in the regulations, in the rulemaking
14 proceedings, to try to bring the 250 tons per year into
15 alignment with the expectation that only large sources
16 will be regulated. That's what EPA is committed to.
17 It's --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: General Verrilli, really, I
19 don't have as expansive a notion of reading exceptions
20 into a statute that are not there as Justice Breyer
21 does. But assuming, just assuming that you can -- you
22 can read exceptions, that isn't the issue here. The
23 issue is whether you can read in exceptions
24 unnecessarily when the absurdity in question doesn't
25 flow inevitably from the statute, when the statute can

1 be interpreted another way that would not produce the
2 absurdity.

3 Aren't you compelled where there is
4 ambiguity to adopt the interpretation of the statute
5 that does not produce absurdity rather than adopting the
6 interpretation that produces absurdity and then going
7 around altering the provisions of the contract -- of the
8 statute? I mean, to take Justice Breyer's bubble gum
9 example, yes, I suppose it -- would you have to make an
10 exception for bubble gum in the display window if the
11 statute were subject to two interpretations, one of
12 which would include display windows, and the other one
13 of which wouldn't.

14 It seems to me of course you would have to
15 adopt the interpretation that didn't include display
16 windows. And that's what is going on here. There's --
17 there's -- yes, there's absurdity but the issue is how
18 is that absurdity to be taken account of? By simply
19 letting EPA rewrite the very clear numbers in the
20 statute, or else by adopting a permissible
21 interpretation of the statute that does not lead to that
22 absurdity. And I think that's quite a different
23 question from -- from what we've been discussing.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: Two points about that, if
25 I could. First, that goes to the question of what

1 triggers the permit application. It's only the
2 expansion of the number of permit applicants that even
3 raises this question of the so-called absurdity. It
4 doesn't go to the -- to the argument -- the Petitioners
5 are making a far more substantial argument, that EPA
6 lacks any authority to consider greenhouse gas emission
7 under the BACT provision and other provisions, even for
8 sources that have a permit for their emissions of
9 non-greenhouse gases.

10 So it only goes to the question of the scope
11 of the triggering provision, not to EPA's authority to
12 use PSD to regulate greenhouse gases for entities that
13 are already subject to the permit for other reasons.

14 Now, with respect to the trigger, what I
15 would say about that, Justice Scalia, is that the
16 statutory language is "any air pollutant." Reading
17 Massachusetts v. EPA, the EPA came to the conclusion
18 that that language necessarily encompasses greenhouse
19 gas emissions. That conclusion is most consistent with
20 the EPA's statutory obligations here, because if the
21 choice -- and you can say the choice is between doing
22 something sensible and absurd results. But really, the
23 choice is between throwing up your hands with respect to
24 what EPA considers to be the most serious air pollution
25 problem we have or trying to deal with the

1 implementation problem that exists with respect to
2 the --

3 JUSTICE KAGAN: And --

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- about 15 percent of
5 the sources. That's really the choice here.

6 JUSTICE KAGAN: General, wouldn't it be
7 right to say that the rule that Justice Scalia is
8 referring to only applies if there are alternative
9 interpretations that are consistent with the legislative
10 purpose. There have to be plausible alternative
11 interpretations of the statute. And reading the phrase
12 "any pollutant" to mean any pollutant except for
13 greenhouse gases for reasons that have nothing to do
14 with the purposes of the statute is not a plausible
15 alternative interpretation. Wouldn't that be the
16 argument?

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, that's exactly the
18 argument, and I think that's exactly what EPA did when
19 it reads Massachusetts v. EPA and its understanding of
20 air pollutant and thought about that in the context of
21 the regulatory goals of this program.

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: In the -- you know, the
23 argument against that is, no, that the statute evidences
24 concern with ambient air quality and requires that to be
25 measured. And the agency acknowledges that you cannot

1 possibly measure the effect on ambient air quality of
2 greenhouse gases.

3 So it is not clearly compatible with the
4 statute to bring greenhouse gases into regulation.

5 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. And the other
6 is -- I mean, this is quite -- I see -- I've got it
7 focused now. It seems to me in my mind that we have two
8 questions, and I think they were well stated by Justice
9 Scalia actually. The first is, what is the alternative
10 interpretation that doesn't apply it here? And that
11 would be an interpretation that doesn't put greenhouse
12 gases within this PSD provision at all. And that might
13 be really unthinkable -- no, not unthinkable, but have
14 worse consequences than worrying about the
15 interpretation of this trigger provision.

16 So either we have to do the one or the
17 other. Either we have to interpret the trigger
18 provision with flexibility so that there are written
19 exceptions -- unwritten exceptions in it, one way or the
20 other, or we have to say you can't do that, and
21 therefore they don't apply to all. Which is worse? Is
22 that a -- have I got it right?

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think that states it
24 fairly. I think that states it fairly.

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't think so. I mean,

1 it depends on what you mean by "unthinkable," General
2 Verrilli. Is it --

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think that was Justice
4 Breyer who said "unthinkable."

5 (Laughter.)

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: But what is supposed to be
7 unthinkable, that greenhouse gases should not be
8 regulated? Maybe that is unthinkable. But the issue
9 is, is it unthinkable that Congress did not intend to
10 regulate greenhouse gases when it enacted the current
11 provisions of the statute?

12 JUSTICE KAGAN: But isn't that the argument?
13 Justice's Scalia's alternative plausible interpretation
14 of the statutes might have been an alternative plausible
15 interpretation of the statute pre-Massachusetts. But it
16 no longer is; isn't that right?

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's certainly true,
18 but it wasn't -- but it -- also, even before
19 Massachusetts, it had -- there's significant problems
20 with it.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: Here we have a statutory
22 provision that has very specific numbers, and the agency
23 has said these numbers are absurd. We're going to
24 multiple them by 400. Now, in the entire history of
25 Federal regulation what is the best example you can give

1 us of an agency's doing something like that, where it
2 has taken a statute with numbers and has crossed them
3 out and written in the numbers that it likes?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: Obviously, I wouldn't
5 characterize it quite that way. I don't have a case
6 that's exactly on point. I think Morton v. Ruiz is a
7 case that's like this in the sense that the agency had
8 an obligation to provide something to a certain
9 population, and it didn't have the funds that made it
10 available to provide it to the whole population that was
11 statutorily entitled, and it made the judgments it made
12 to try to get the program to work. And I mean, if I
13 could give you a hypothetical --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What was that case?

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: Morton v. Ruiz. And --
16 and if I gave you a hypothetical on that -- if Congress
17 enacted a statute that said that the -- the Customs
18 authorities, border authorities have an obligation to
19 search every cargo container that comes into a port in
20 the United States for radioactive materials, but no
21 container shall be delayed more than 3 days, if a-- if
22 an agency were faced with those kinds of obligations,
23 and it didn't have the resources to get every container
24 searched within 3 days, and it said well, what we're
25 going to do is search the containers that come from

1 places where we think the risk is most likely, I think
2 everyone would think that that's a reasonable
3 interpretation of the -- of the agency's charge under
4 the statute; and that's essentially what the EPA has
5 done here.

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Just to be clear, you're
7 not saying -- or are you saying -- that if you're denied
8 the authority you seek here, there can be no significant
9 regulation of greenhouse gases under the Act? You are
10 not saying that?

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. I think -- I want to
12 provide some more specificity, though, in my answer if I
13 could. The Court has held in American Electric Power
14 that the EPA has the authority to prescribe general
15 national standards. Now, with respect to the PSD
16 program, I want to -- I do want to emphasize that there
17 is a distinction between the question of what triggers
18 your obligation to get a PSD permit and whether your
19 emissions of greenhouse gases count as any air pollutant
20 that triggers it, versus a situation in which if you are
21 already subject to a PSD permit because you are
22 emitting, say, a NAAQS pollutant or another one of the
23 regulated pollutants, whether under Section 7574(a)(4),
24 you have to meet the Best Available Control Technology
25 requirement, which is phrased in terms of a requirement

1 for each pollutant subject to regulation under the Act.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's the 80 --
3 that's the 8386 question, right?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct, Your
5 Honor. That's correct. And so I think those things are
6 different. And so there really are three points.
7 There's 7411, there's triggering, and then there's if --
8 if you're already subject to the permit. And the
9 questions about whether the PSD program is limited
10 entirely to pollutants that affect local ambient air
11 quality, I just don't think that adds up at the end of
12 the day.

13 For one thing, EPA has been regulating since
14 1988 under the PSD program something called
15 ozone-depleting substances. We talked about this a
16 little bit in our brief. Those are substances that have
17 no local effects; they -- they are substances that are
18 released; they go up into the stratosphere; and they eat
19 up the ozone and that then creates additional
20 ultraviolet rays which cause cancer and cataracts.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that has local
22 effects. I mean, everybody knows there's smog in Los
23 Angeles versus Montana, right?

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, that -- well, if
25 those local effects count, then certainly, greenhouse

1 gases have those kinds of local effects, because they
2 raise the sea levels, which cause flooding in certain
3 places and they cause droughts in other places. And so,
4 to the extent you're talking about local effects, the
5 greenhouse gases really aren't local.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Where have the sea levels
7 risen other than Massachusetts?

8 (Laughter.)

9 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, certainly
10 Massachusetts, but -- but with respect -- but EPA has
11 been regulating ozone-depleting substances since 1988.

12 JUSTICE ALITO: Is it your argument Congress
13 has acquiesced in that?

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. In fact, we think
15 in 1990, that they ratified it. Because in 1990,
16 Congress undertook a very substantial amendment of the
17 Clean Air Act. One thing they did was specifically
18 address ozone-depleting substances. They created a new
19 Title VI for ozone-depleting substances, so they were
20 clearly focused on it. And they did not pull
21 ozone-depleting substances out of the PSD program at
22 that time. They left them in. And that's significant
23 because they did pull out hazardous air pollution -- air
24 pollutants, which was another new category they created
25 in 1990 for the PSD program.

1 JUSTICE ALITO: I thought there was a very
2 short time lag between EPA's assertion of the authority
3 to regulate the ozone-depleting substances under the PSD
4 program and the enactment of --

5 GENERAL VERRILLI: 2 years. It was 2 years.

6 JUSTICE ALITO: So was it a full 2 years?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: I don't know if it was a
8 full 2 years, but -- but the Congress focused
9 specifically on exactly how ozone-depleting substances
10 were going to be regulated under the Clean Air Act, and
11 they created a new -- they were -- it's not an accident.
12 They were focused exactly on how they were going to be
13 regulated. So I do think -- so I do think it's quite a
14 strong ratification argument. And --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What's the -- I know
16 litigants hate this question. If you were going to
17 lose, what's the best way for you to lose?

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: I knew you were going to
19 ask me that question.

20 (Laughter.)

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: So I actually think, you
22 know, there's the Judge Kavanaugh approach, there's the
23 ACC approach, you know, we -- obviously, we're not
24 endorsing this, but --

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: There's a difference

1 between them.

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: There is a significant
3 difference between them. But --

4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So which one? Either one
5 of them?

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I've got another
7 thought on that subject --

8 (Laughter.)

9 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- which is, as I said to
10 Justice Alito earlier, the whole problem in terms of
11 expanding the permitting requirement is CO2. And so
12 that if the Court were to say that "any air pollutant"
13 can't be interpreted in the way that EPA has interpreted
14 it at the trigger level, to mean what we think it says,
15 and what Massachusetts v. EPA compelled, but if the
16 Court disagrees with that, it seems to me the -- the
17 answer that is least problematic from EPA's point of
18 view does the -- is the least dissonant and the least --
19 causes the least risk of collateral consequences with
20 respect to established regulatory programs, which go
21 beyond NAAQS pollutants under PSD, would be to say that
22 you can't read any air pollutant to include CO2, because
23 the inclusion of CO2 generates a permitting obligation
24 that is out of accord with what Congress would have
25 expected. I think -- I'm not endorsing that, but I

1 think that's --

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, what -- what about
3 BACT for CO2, then?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, no. BACT would be
5 in -- that's just at the trigger, Justice Ginsburg.
6 Just at the trigger. We think that the -- I just don't
7 see, given that BACT says in unambiguous terms in
8 Section 7475(a)(4) that anybody who's subject to a
9 permit has got to meet BACT for each pollutant subject
10 to regulation under the chapter, meaning the Act. I
11 just don't see how you can get out from under that --

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You've got to
13 follow -- you've got to follow the plain text of the
14 statute there.

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, if the command of
16 the statute is that BACT applies for each pollutant
17 subject to regulation --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yeah, but the plan
19 of the statute is 250 tons per year, too; and you've
20 changed that to 100,000 tons per year.

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: Right, but I think --

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And you were going to get
23 to 7475(3), (a), (b), (c) on that point.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, 7475(3)(c) also
25 does say that if -- if EPA does set a greenhouse gas

1 standard for a particular stationary source like power
2 plants, then that becomes a condition of the permit.
3 That's what (c) (3) says. And so between (c) (3) and
4 BACT, greenhouse gas -- assuming that EPA acts under
5 7411, those, it seems to me, have to be in.

6 This is a question about the definition of
7 the trigger. Now, we don't agree with it. But -- but
8 in trying to faithfully answer Your Honor's question,
9 that's what I think. That that's --

10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I just want to be clear.
11 Your reading or -- or your suggested out would mean
12 that -- that only the major facilities as defined now
13 essentially would -- would --

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: If you took CO2 out of
15 the equation, I don't think this -- the expanded scope
16 of the permitting obligation is going to happen, because
17 it's the CO2 emissions that expand the scope. And so
18 that's why -- you know, I'm not endorsing this. I'm
19 just saying --

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, Justice Breyer
21 said the difference between 83 percent and 86 percent,
22 that 3 percent difference of who you're covering is
23 thousands and thousands of people.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct.

25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Or entities, I should

1 say, not people, of institutions. Is that going to be
2 the same under the reading that you are proposing?

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: Pretty close. But I
4 think -- but I think the reason that we would -- the
5 reason that the exclusion of CO2 seems to me to be the
6 least problematic is that EPA does have an established
7 regulatory framework here that applies not just to NAAQS
8 pollutants, but to the other non-NAAQS pollutants,
9 sulfuric acid mist and the other things that EPA
10 regulates under the PSD program. And you wouldn't be
11 redefining the trigger to exclude those things which
12 have previously been included. That's, I think, the --
13 the rifle shot solution, to the extent that the Court
14 thinks it's a problem.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, wouldn't the proper
16 answer be if we are rejecting your entire position to
17 say there are these other options? We're not going to
18 say take out CO2. We're not going to say adopt the
19 Kavanaugh approach. We're going to say those are
20 choices for EPA to make.

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, certainly that's
22 right. Certainly, that's right. But I think the -- the
23 argument that, as I -- as I read Judge Kavanaugh's
24 opinion and as I understood my friend's argument on
25 behalf of the ACC, was that the statute essentially

1 compelled the conclusion that you had to pick one or the
2 other of those alternative readings in order to avoid
3 expanding the permitting obligation.

4 And the problem with that way of thinking
5 about it is that there are many other pollutants,
6 non-NAAQS pollutants that EPA has regulated for years
7 and used as a trigger for years to require PSD permits,
8 which you would be at risk of excluding from the program
9 if you were to adopt the ACC or the Judge Kavanaugh
10 reading as triggers, and that's a problem that, it seems
11 to me, the Court ought to be thinking about trying to
12 avoid.

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I have to say in reading
14 the brief for the States and reading your brief, I -- I
15 couldn't find a single precedent that strongly supports
16 your position. *Brown & Williamson* I think is
17 distinguishable for the reasons set forth in the reply
18 brief. And what are the cases you want me to cite if I
19 write the opinion to sustain your position?

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: So at the -- at the --
21 sustaining the argument that the trigger applies here, I
22 do think there aren't -- there's aren't a lot of cases.
23 You're right. This is not a -- a situation that arises
24 very often. I think *Morton v. Ruiz* comes the closest.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's not cited

1 in your brief, is it?

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, it's not, Mr. Chief
3 Justice. That's true. It was cited and relied upon by
4 the EPA in the rulemaking proceedings and rulemaking
5 opinions.

6 So if I could just sum up here. The EPA did
7 what it did because the problem it's confronting is a
8 problem that EPA considers to be urgent.

9 JUSTICE ALITO: General, I don't want to
10 interrupt your summation, but on the -- let me just ask
11 this quick question. On the issue of what happens with
12 a facility that is subject to the PSD program because of
13 the emission of other pollutants, the Petitioners argue
14 that the permitting process would be entirely different
15 for greenhouse gases because it would make no sense to
16 require monitoring of local air conditions and -- air
17 conditions. It would make no sense to try to assess the
18 effect of the emission of the greenhouse gases on the
19 area in the region. Could you just give a quick
20 response to that?

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: You know, I'm glad you
22 raised that, Justice Alito. That's actually quite
23 important. That's just not right. I mean, if you think
24 about it in multiple ways, there are multiple pollutants
25 that are currently regulated under the PSD program.

1 Some of them have National Ambient Air Quality
2 Standards, and the local testing makes sense for those.
3 Others don't have National Air Quality -- Ambient Air
4 Quality Standards, like sulfuric acid mists, for
5 example, and others. There aren't standards for those.

6 And the way EPA has handled that is they
7 look at the regulations. The regulation says in terms
8 of the monitoring that the statute requires, there's a
9 specific exemption for substances that are otherwise
10 regulated but for which there is no NAAQS or related
11 standard. So they're just exempt from the monitoring
12 requirement.

13 There's also an analysis requirement. And
14 what EPA has said and what the States do in their
15 permitting processes with respect to the analysis
16 requirement for the non-NAAQS substances, for example,
17 sulfuric acid mists, is to apply a very simple idea.
18 You're not trying in that situation to make sure that
19 the particular emissions aren't having -- are consistent
20 with the overall ambient air quality level. It's a very
21 simple calculus. More is worse; less is better.

22 And so with respect to things like sulfuric
23 acid mist, with respect to things like ozone-depleting
24 substances, that is how it has always worked at the
25 State level under the PSD program. You just -- you look

1 at what the BACT emissions levels are. You try to get
2 them down.

3 And so you're not treating greenhouse gases
4 any differently than sulfuric acid mists or
5 ozone-depleting substances or the others that don't have
6 those requirements.

7 And then in terms of localized effects
8 versus wider effects, I mean, I would just remind the
9 Court about the EMC-Homer City case from just a few
10 months ago -- it's not at all unusual that the EPA would
11 be regulating emissions in one place because they --
12 they impose effects hundreds or even thousands of miles
13 away.

14 The pollutants emitted in Ohio or Kentucky
15 contribute to the air pollution levels in New Haven or
16 Bangor, Maine. That's what that case was all about.
17 And so -- and you regulate those pollutants also through
18 the PSD program. And so you don't -- you aren't in that
19 situation looking just to see what happens in the local
20 area. It's just never been the nature of this program.
21 It's not -- it just doesn't work that way.

22 And if I could just remind the Court, in
23 conclusion, why EPA did what it did, it is because this
24 is an urgent problem. Every year that passes, this
25 problem gets worse, and the threat to future generations

1 get worse. And I think, faced with the obligations that
2 EPA had, it made the most reasonable choice available to
3 it. Thank you.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, you've got
5 five extra minutes, to be -- to be fair.

6 And one thing --

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: You should have told me
8 that before my summation.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You had already
11 gotten going. I didn't want to disturb -- you don't
12 think that greenhouse gases should be regulated at the
13 250-tons-per-year level, right? You said Congress did
14 not intend that, and it would be absurd.

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. Certainly --

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So what level do you
17 think they should be regulated at? In other words, what
18 intelligible principle are you taking from the statute
19 to say we're going to -- we're at 100 now. We're going
20 to aim for 50 or -- in other words, if you had all the
21 resources you need, what level would you pick as the
22 proper one --

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- other than --
25 since it's not 250?

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: You would want to look at
2 the definition of what it means to emit 250 tons per
3 year, and then you'd want to think about the underlying
4 notion that what Congress is trying to do is to impose
5 these obligations on facilities that are capable of
6 responding to them, that are going to tend to be
7 facilities that are major in quality. And then those
8 are the things that are going to guide you in trying to
9 figure out what the number is. And I think that is what
10 EPA is trying to do.

11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Could I make sure I
12 understand that? Would you pick the number that leads
13 to the same class of emitters? Is that the number you
14 would pick?

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: I'm sorry, Justice Kagan.
16 The same class of emitters as?

17 JUSTICE KAGAN: As in the more typical
18 emissions context, right. So 100 --

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: It might -- I don't think
20 it would --

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- captures a certain set of
22 emitters. Are you essentially looking for the number
23 that captures the same class of emitters?

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think -- I don't know
25 that it will be the same, but I think it'll be -- but I

1 think the -- the class will be a lot smaller than the
2 class under EPA's current understanding of what it means
3 to emit 250 tons per year.

4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, how did the EPA
5 come at -- settle on the number?

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yeah, they tried to
7 explain that in -- in one of the rulemaking orders, and
8 I think what they did was to try to figure out the right
9 balance point where they were accomplishing very
10 significant emissions limitations while not sweeping in
11 sources that were -- these very large number of small
12 sources that were only making the incremental -- an
13 incremental difference.

14 And what EPA did was say, essentially, we
15 can get to 85 percent of the emissions we're trying to
16 get to by setting the standards where we've set them.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Why -- two things. One is,
18 you haven't said anything about the Title V problem,
19 which they said was at 6.1 million persons or
20 individuals or, you know, businesses coming into it. So
21 how do you get them out of that one?

22 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think the
23 streamlining. Same idea, I mean --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: It's the same basic point.
25 Okay. Why -- there would be a good reason for this, but

1 the bell that it rang is that agencies have tremendous
2 authority about how they distribute their enforcement
3 resources. They don't have to enforce everything
4 against everything. And that is a basic principle.
5 They have to put their money where it will do the most
6 good. And so why wasn't that -- no one's really argued
7 it --

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: I just wondered. It's sort
10 of like the missing --

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: There would be a helpful
12 point for us, but for this, and then I'll tell you
13 why -- explain why we didn't, because there is a citizen
14 suit provision in the -- in the law. And so the --
15 that's what they'll tell you on rebuttal.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: And so, I think that's
18 the reason why because it's subject to a citizen suit,
19 whether we exercise our --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: In other words, you would
21 be out of it totally, and any citizen could go bring a
22 suit and say where is your permit?

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: Right.

24 JUSTICE BREYER: I see.

25 GENERAL VERRILLI: If there are no further

1 questions? Thank you.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General.

3 Mr. Keisler, 5 minutes.

4 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF PETER KEISLER

5 ON BEHALF OF PRIVATE PARTY PETITIONERS

6 MR. KEISLER: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

7 You had asked the Solicitor General what
8 would BACT involve in this kind of situation. And I
9 think Your Honor gave a perhaps absurd hypothetical
10 about light bulbs. Your Honor should know that EPA's
11 instruction to the State and local permitting
12 authorities does address light bulbs in the cafeteria.
13 What it says is that State and local permitting
14 authorities likely -- likely do not need to look at
15 whether more efficient light bulbs should be used in a
16 plant's cafeteria because that probably would not be
17 worth the burden in terms of the payoff.

18 But the fact that they are talking about it
19 at that level of detail just brings into sharp relief
20 that this PSD process when applied to greenhouse gases,
21 which is about energy efficiency, not about adding
22 technology to control the stuff that comes out of smoke
23 stacks, is pervasive in potentially affecting every
24 aspect of an industrial plant's operation and asking the
25 90 State and local permitting authorities to decide what

1 needs to be done and that's what is so different between
2 this and the NSPS program which functions by setting
3 emissions standards that each plant can then decide how
4 best --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what do I do with the
6 examples in the brief of the 144 permits that have
7 already been given, people who have managed to come into
8 compliance under BACT?

9 MR. KEISLER: It's certainly not our
10 submission that every single determination by every one
11 of these authorities is going to be unreasonable or
12 outrageous or is going to reach into the cafeterias.
13 But it is the scope of this is so different in nature
14 and kind than the NSPS program, which would set
15 efficient standards that people would be able to meet.

16 And the second point I would like to make,
17 Your Honor, is there is a selectivity about what the
18 agency considers ambiguous and unambiguous. It
19 unambiguously is required to apply Massachusetts'
20 definition of "pollutant," but "any air pollutant" is
21 ambiguous enough to accommodate any regulated air
22 pollutant.

23 But 100 and 250 tons per year, that's really
24 ambiguous because it can mean 100,000. And I mention
25 this because the selectiveness with which EPA has turned

1 the ambiguity on and off so that in combination it
2 maximizes the agency's discretion shows that when we
3 talk about what is -- what does the least violence to
4 the statute, we have to think about it, among other
5 things, along the parameter of separation of powers and
6 whether the way in which the agency has perceived it
7 here has arrogated an exceptional and troubling degree
8 of discretion to design its own climate change program.
9 And finally with respect to the different definitions of
10 pollutant, we have certainly proceeded here as if we are
11 defining that particular word in the statute but here is
12 another way to think about the interpretative exercise
13 here and that is Brown & Williamson. Brown & Williamson
14 started with the assumption that the definitions in the
15 statute of drug and device encompassed nicotine and
16 cigarettes but then it went on to say that giving the
17 FDA jurisdiction under those programs over tobacco would
18 be inconsistent with the regulatory structure. When it
19 did that it didn't go back to those definition and say
20 we have to figure out which word in that definition
21 means something different than what we originally
22 assumed. It says that the interpretation as a whole
23 conflicted with the statute as a whole and that was
24 sufficient. We think the same is true here.

25 If the Court has no further questions, I

1 thank the Court.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel,
3 counsel. The case is submitted.

4 (Whereupon, at 11:42 a.m., the case in the
5 above-titled matter was submitted.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

<p>A</p> <p>\$20,000 41:14</p> <p>a.m 3:3 5:2 91:4</p> <p>abilities 59:3</p> <p>able 32:20 38:5 89:15</p> <p>above-entitled 3:1</p> <p>above-titled 91:5</p> <p>absurd 5:20 48:18 67:22 70:23 84:14 88:9</p> <p>absurdity 17:20 36:19 39:23,24 40:1 65:24 66:2,5,6,17,18 66:22 67:3</p> <p>ACC 75:23 79:25 80:9</p> <p>accept 42:23 44:22 57:1</p> <p>accident 47:15 75:11</p> <p>accommodate 35:11 89:21</p> <p>accomplishing 86:9</p> <p>accord 76:24</p> <p>account 66:18</p> <p>achieve 55:5</p> <p>acid 79:9 82:4 82:17,23 83:4</p> <p>acknowledged 39:19 53:5</p> <p>acknowledges 41:12 68:25</p> <p>acquiesced 74:13</p> <p>act 6:2 7:8 8:11 12:8 13:6,20 18:8 19:22 20:20 21:1,22 21:25 33:12 34:25 35:14,20</p>	<p>36:14,23 42:20 43:25 44:21 45:7 49:8 53:23 63:5,12 64:1 72:9 73:1 74:17 75:10 77:10</p> <p>acts 78:4</p> <p>add 32:3</p> <p>added 32:7 49:8 49:9</p> <p>adding 32:8 88:21</p> <p>additional 20:22 22:8 49:5,19 51:20 52:15 73:19</p> <p>address 8:23 26:12 29:3 74:18 88:12</p> <p>addressed 29:4 30:6</p> <p>addresses 30:9</p> <p>addressing 24:25 59:20</p> <p>adds 73:11</p> <p>adjust 6:4</p> <p>adjustments 8:18</p> <p>administer 57:23</p> <p>administrations 17:18</p> <p>administrativ... 8:17</p> <p>adopt 66:4,15 79:18 80:9</p> <p>adopted 5:15 29:9 37:15</p> <p>adopting 66:5 66:20</p> <p>advanced 53:17 53:18</p> <p>advances 51:22 64:4</p> <p>AEP 19:18 22:16 26:8,16</p>	<p>affect 50:22 73:10</p> <p>afforded 8:7</p> <p>agencies 42:17 87:1</p> <p>agency 1:6,13,22 2:5,12,20 5:5 5:20,25 6:3 8:3 8:5,7,10 10:13 10:23 14:2,21 14:23 17:1 27:18,22 34:3 39:22 42:1 43:21 44:1,4 44:10,11 45:13 53:24 54:2,12 56:13 68:25 70:22 71:7,22 89:18 90:6</p> <p>agency's 71:1 72:3 90:2</p> <p>agency-created 33:22</p> <p>ago 83:10</p> <p>agree 9:2,6 17:6 17:21 24:11 33:10 37:18 78:7</p> <p>agreement 33:15</p> <p>agrees 5:14 35:13</p> <p>aim 55:5 56:8 84:20</p> <p>aimed 47:2,3</p> <p>air 1:3 5:4 6:9 6:15 7:8,13,22 9:24 10:10 12:7,8 13:8,18 13:19,20,21,22 17:11,17 18:9 18:12,20 19:22 21:4,12,13 25:1,20 27:25 28:20 33:11,12 33:13,16 34:25 35:11,13,16,20</p>	<p>35:20,23 36:3 36:4,6,8,12,13 36:14,20 37:12 37:14 38:2 39:5,6,8,18 40:8 42:4,11 42:14,21,22,25 42:25 43:17 45:5,7,9,13 47:10,17 49:11 50:23 53:20,22 61:5 63:6 67:16,24 68:20 68:24 69:1 72:19 73:10 74:17,23,23 75:10 76:12,22 81:16,16 82:1 82:3,3,20 83:15 89:20,21</p> <p>airborne 33:14 35:17,17 36:2 36:7,12 42:7</p> <p>akin 35:6</p> <p>AL 1:10,14,19 1:23 2:2,6,9,13 2:17,21</p> <p>Alabama 37:19</p> <p>alignment 65:15</p> <p>Alito 12:5,16 54:21 55:4,8 55:23 56:5 61:4,13 70:21 74:12 75:1,6 76:10 81:9,22</p> <p>Alito's 59:24 63:2</p> <p>allow 51:23</p> <p>alter 54:7</p> <p>altering 66:7</p> <p>alternative 32:2 48:9 68:8,10 68:15 69:9 70:13,14 80:2</p> <p>ambient 27:25 50:23 63:6 68:24 69:1</p>	<p>73:10 82:1,3 82:20</p> <p>ambiguity 8:2 37:22,25 66:4 90:1</p> <p>ambiguous 39:22,23 89:18 89:21,24</p> <p>amendment 74:16</p> <p>America 55:15</p> <p>American 1:9 19:11 30:9 46:1,21 53:16 72:13</p> <p>amicus 50:20</p> <p>amounts 30:13</p> <p>analysis 18:17 18:19,20 20:22 23:9 60:21 82:13,15</p> <p>Angeles 73:23</p> <p>animals 64:21</p> <p>anomalous 40:4</p> <p>answer 21:20 40:11 55:9 58:14 63:2,2 72:12 76:17 78:8 79:16</p> <p>answering 28:9</p> <p>answers 31:20 31:23 56:12</p> <p>anybody 18:3 77:8</p> <p>anyway 11:10 53:4</p> <p>apartment 11:5</p> <p>apex 44:2</p> <p>APPEARAN... 3:4</p> <p>appears 19:21 20:21 21:1 35:21,24 36:14 45:7</p> <p>appendix 13:12 18:17 41:1 47:6,22</p>
--	--	---	---	---

applicability 9:19	27:9,12 28:20	56:16 90:14	BACT 9:4 29:12 48:24 49:2,22 50:16 67:7 77:3,4,7,9,16 78:4 83:1 88:8 89:8	bill 40:19,21,23 Billings 40:13 bit 73:16 blue 19:14 boilers 57:21 border 71:18 bottom 25:10 bound 19:9 breach 49:24 breathe 13:23 Breyer 13:24 23:21,25 24:4 24:8 25:3,7 38:7,13,16 39:15 40:10 42:10 43:8,14 47:1 56:18 57:3,11,15,19 57:25 58:6,17 58:25 64:16 65:7,20 69:5 70:4 78:20 86:17,24 87:9 87:16,20,24
applicable 47:12 48:8	argue 81:13 argued 87:6 arguing 6:14 7:3	atextual 33:22 atmosphere 28:2 attainment 6:17 28:3,4 30:14 32:15	balance 86:9 Bangor 83:16 bar 49:3,22 based 6:5 basic 86:24 87:4 basically 16:24 basis 5:22 27:16 49:2 56:16 bears 13:19 began 18:24 beginning 30:5 50:3 behalf 3:5,8,10 4:4,7,10,13 5:9 7:5 9:14 33:6 45:20 79:25 88:5	brief 9:5,9 13:13 19:14 28:11 29:20 30:9 47:23 50:19,20 52:4 73:16 80:14,14,18 81:1 89:6 briefly 30:4 briefs 6:12,20 9:12 bring 15:12 60:25 61:1 65:14 69:4 87:21 brings 52:16 88:19 broad 17:2 20:19 28:14 broader 8:25 brought 15:9 16:2
applicants 67:2	argument 3:2 4:2,5,8,11 5:4 5:8 7:6 9:16 30:5,6,8 31:4,7 31:13,16,17,18 31:24,25 33:5 44:23 45:19 52:11,14 67:4 67:5 68:16,18 68:23 70:12 74:12 75:14 79:23,24 80:21 88:4	Austin 3:8 authorities 22:21,22 23:10 23:17 24:21,25 25:23 27:11,15 71:18,18 88:12 88:14,25 89:11 authority 7:8 26:11 33:25 39:10 40:16,24 46:2,5,13,14 46:21 55:20 57:4 61:5,24 63:11,21 67:6 67:11 72:8,14 75:2 87:2	beings 52:20 belabor 48:1 believe 13:25 58:3 believes 6:1 45:5 bell 87:1 benefit 18:5 benefits 6:6 best 9:20 15:3 15:11,24 23:16 24:18 28:21 29:8,18 38:17 44:12 47:20,24 48:5,24 49:2 50:6,7,12 51:21 70:25 72:24 75:17 89:4 better 51:23 82:21 beyond 18:3 76:21 big 12:10 64:24 65:1	
application 59:22 67:1	arisen 62:1 arises 44:6 80:23 arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2 average 41:14 avoid 39:22,24 40:1,3,5 80:2 80:12		
applied 11:7 19:21 20:20 36:13 38:23 88:20	arguments 7:6 9:15 31:11,14 32:2 52:4	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
applies 13:14 29:10,19 30:24 30:25 33:22 49:25 50:1 62:4,6 63:25 68:8 77:16 79:7 80:21	arisen 62:1 arises 44:6 80:23	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
apply 14:5,13,15 20:15 29:8,13 31:12 53:23 57:12,13 62:7 64:22 69:10,21 82:17 89:19	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
applying 5:15 20:10 28:21,24 29:2 50:16 54:24 56:6	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
approach 14:14 14:15 19:13,14 34:17,23 63:14 75:22,23 79:19	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
appropriate 25:4 55:20	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
approve 26:17 26:18	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
area 6:16 10:8 14:1 18:22 24:23 28:1 30:14,24 31:1 31:2 32:15 81:19 83:20	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
area-specific 7:13,17,19,22 9:24 10:10 13:8 18:9 23:8 23:14 25:1,16	arrogated 90:7 aside 17:20 36:19 52:14,19 asked 22:10 47:1 88:7 asking 7:3 23:17 37:25 88:24 aspect 13:3,4 88:24 assert 10:13 asserting 61:24 assertion 44:19 45:8 63:10 75:2 assess 81:17 assessment 6:6 assigned 25:22 27:10 assume 18:5 19:8 63:5 assumed 90:22 assuming 37:18 65:21,21 78:4 assumption	available 9:20 15:3,12,25 18:19 28:21 29:8,18 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:6,8 50:12 51:22 71:10 72:24 84:2		
		B		
		b 3:9 4:9 14:2,5 19:13 24:1 45:19 47:9 48:7 77:23 back 45:16 48:14 49:6 53:11 56:19 58:1 59:24 90:19		

Brown 34:2 44:15 80:16 90:13,13	case 5:4,12 6:12 11:18,18 14:11 17:21 19:1,9 19:11 20:12 22:7,17 24:9 26:4,5,10,20 33:10 40:6 44:10 46:22 71:5,7,14 83:9 83:16 91:3,4	77:10 characterize 71:5 charge 72:3 chemical 17:25 chemist 52:22 Chemistry 1:9 30:9 53:16 Chevron 44:2 55:20 Chief 5:3,10 10:18,22 18:24 19:16 28:7,23 29:22,23 30:1 33:3,7 45:17 45:21 50:7,21 51:8,12,13 52:2,10,13 53:1 58:8 63:1 63:18,24 64:2 73:2,21 77:12 77:18 80:25 81:2 84:4,10 84:16,24 88:2 88:6 91:2	citizen 87:13,18 87:21 City 83:9 claiming 35:4 clarify 9:2 32:6 class 17:2 85:13 85:16,23 86:1 86:2 classic 44:10 64:20 Clean 7:8 12:8 13:20 18:7 19:22 33:12 34:25 35:20 36:13 45:7 74:17 75:10 clear 5:24 17:9 18:14 27:1,17 55:9 58:14 66:19 72:6 78:10 clearly 11:20 12:7 44:17 69:3 74:20 climate 90:8 close 79:3 closest 80:24 CO2 43:15 61:9 61:11,22 76:11 76:22,23 77:3 78:14,17 79:5 79:18	comment 23:5 24:16 26:15 Commerce 2:16 19:14 commission 26:10 committed 65:12,16 common 64:22 comparable 64:13 compatible 69:3 compelled 66:3 76:15 80:1 compels 64:11 complement 58:18 complete 60:11 completely 37:8 60:1 compliance 28:1 89:8 complicated 44:4 59:1 complied 48:10 48:12 compounds 35:18 comprehensiv... 49:11 concentrations 28:1 concern 28:14 68:24 conclude 18:8 33:24 45:11 conclusion 5:21 37:20 67:17,19 80:1 83:23 condition 78:2 conditions 18:21 25:21 27:8 81:16,17 conduct 23:11 conducted 18:18 conflicted 90:23 confluence
<hr/> C <hr/>	cause 63:6 73:20 74:2,3 causes 61:12 76:19 causing 41:7 46:7 Cavanaugh 31:3 central 13:9 certain 13:19 29:21 59:2 62:5,6 71:8 74:2 85:21 certainly 10:6 10:12 17:9 26:16,17 41:17 65:5 70:17 73:25 74:9 79:21,22 84:15 89:9 90:10 Chamber 2:16 19:14 change 21:23 53:25 55:18 61:6 64:5 90:8 changed 44:12 77:20 changes 56:21 chapter 47:13	Chinese 41:18 choice 39:4,7,8 39:13,14,17,24 40:2,14,23 41:21 67:21,21 67:23 68:5 84:2 choices 6:13 39:4 79:20 choose 7:11 37:2 44:11 choosing 37:3 chosen 40:19 41:21 cigarettes 90:16 Circuit 9:3 20:4 circumstance 35:2 44:12 circumstances 62:1 64:9,15 cite 23:22 80:18 cited 80:25 81:3	clean 5:24 17:9 18:14 27:1,17 55:9 58:14 66:19 72:6 78:10 clearly 11:20 12:7 44:17 69:3 74:20 climate 90:8 close 79:3 closest 80:24 CO2 43:15 61:9 61:11,22 76:11 76:22,23 77:3 78:14,17 79:5 79:18 collateral 76:19 combination 90:1 come 8:4 37:20 51:23 71:25 86:5 89:7 comes 30:21 31:10 71:19 80:24 88:22 coming 35:7 86:20 command 12:2,3 14:22 17:10 24:20 37:19 77:15	

64:15 confronting 81:7 confused 15:1 Congress 5:18 5:25 11:1,15 12:2,7 14:1 16:5 18:19 27:14 33:24 34:1,21 35:5 40:12 41:21 43:24 44:13 45:2 46:20 47:23 48:3 49:20 55:2 59:7 60:4 70:9 71:16 74:12,16 75:8 76:24 84:13 85:4 Congress's 5:19 congressional 11:8 17:10 conjunction 46:11 Connecticut 19:11,19 22:16 26:6,8,16 connection 48:22 consequences 69:14 76:19 consider 67:6 considering 51:19 considers 67:24 81:8 89:18 consistent 19:15 55:19 67:19 68:9 82:19 consists 13:16 consolidated 5:6 constitute 56:25 constitutes 56:14 constructed 50:4 construction	33:12 42:8,21 45:6 50:1 construe 39:22 39:23 43:17 45:13 construed 19:25 20:2 construing 40:2 40:4 consumption 51:14 contain 23:1 container 71:19 71:21,23 containers 71:25 contemplating 58:20 context 20:3,22 21:15,17 27:1 45:11 68:20 85:18 contexts 35:12 continually 6:4 continue 16:7 continued 31:17 contract 66:7 contradict 21:22 contrary 5:19 27:24 contravening 11:8 contribute 12:25 83:15 contributing 23:7 contributor 58:22 control 9:20 15:3,12 24:20 28:21 29:8,19 38:18 43:15 45:2 47:21,25 48:5,25 50:6,8 50:12 51:20,22 51:24 72:24 88:22 controlled 42:13	43:1 controls 24:22 conundrum 16:12,14 converge 57:11 copy 25:8 corner 41:18 correct 8:24,24 21:11 52:9,12 57:24 73:4,5 78:24 correctly 59:13 cost 6:6 costs 11:3 41:14 Council 1:10 30:9 53:17 counsel 18:24 33:3 91:2,3 count 72:19 73:25 counterintuitive 20:13,14 22:6 country 28:3,4 course 42:16 51:18 54:5 62:17 66:14 court 1:1 3:2 5:11 6:12 9:13 14:20 19:23 20:3,9,12,15 20:18 22:3,15 22:18 30:7 33:8 38:1 39:20 42:5 44:14,19 45:4 45:8,15,16,22 46:1,19 65:4 72:13 76:12,16 79:13 80:11 83:9,22 90:25 91:1 Court's 33:1,13 courts 14:6 cover 20:23 40:17 63:12 covered 11:6 28:12 63:7	64:6 covering 78:22 create 62:23 created 74:18,24 75:11 creates 12:19 73:19 criteria 9:4 15:6 27:20 32:7,23 63:4 critical 48:23 critically 22:13 crossed 71:2 cumulative 62:22 cure 62:9 curious 31:15 current 50:23 70:10 86:2 currently 63:4 64:3 81:25 Customs 71:17	deeper 8:22 62:23 defend 31:24 Defense 19:23 defer 8:4 deference 8:3,7 40:6 44:3,3,10 55:20 define 60:19 defined 19:24 41:23,24 78:12 defining 90:11 definition 19:25 20:7,10,16,18 21:5,8,14 35:19,24 38:9 38:12,19 42:4 42:24,25 43:7 44:18 47:20 64:11 78:6 85:2 89:20 90:19,20 definitions 37:15 90:9,14 degree 90:7 degrees 9:9 delayed 62:22 71:21 delegate 14:23 delegated 33:24 deli 41:18 denied 72:7 depart 42:2 Department 3:10 depending 37:16 depends 70:1 describe 34:23 described 17:8 21:3 39:25 51:18 design 90:8 designate 63:14 designating 26:13 designations
D				
D 5:1 14:3,5 D.C 2:23 3:5,10 9:3 day 19:22 56:17 73:12 days 71:21,24 deal 11:15 24:18 24:23 28:17 67:25 dealing 12:19 50:24 61:25 decades 39:20 40:8 decide 23:6,18 24:22 44:1 55:17 63:8 88:25 89:3 decided 19:23 deciding 56:14 decision 22:2 decisions 27:15 deemed 55:22 deems 25:4				

designed 12:24 29:3,4 37:5	directly 21:9	Donuts 55:14	67:6 81:13,18	76:25 78:18
detail 88:19	disaggregates 28:10	drastically 60:24	emissions 7:13	energy 50:25
deterioration 13:15,18 18:11 18:12 25:19,19 27:5	disagreed 25:11	draw 54:15,17	9:8 13:16	51:5,9,14
determination 9:20 14:23 89:10	disagrees 76:16	drive 34:8	18:23 23:15	88:21
determinations 11:18	disbursed 28:22	driving 62:16	24:17 26:15	ENERGY-IN...
determine 23:16	discarded 36:16	droughts 74:3	30:13 46:3,6	1:17
develop 51:19	discrepancy 12:13	drug 38:5 44:17 44:18,21 90:15	47:12 50:17	enforce 42:17
development 58:4	discretion 35:5	due 54:11	51:1,1 52:8,21	87:3
device 90:15	discussed 22:15	Duke 19:23	67:8,19 72:19	enforcement 59:2 87:2
differ 13:25	discussing 47:16	Dunkin 55:14	78:17 82:19	engage 24:23
difference 12:6	66:23		83:1,11 85:18	entire 70:24
12:10 24:15	discussion 18:25	E	86:10,15 89:3	79:16
32:24,25 75:25	28:10 50:17	e 4:1 5:1,1 23:9	emit 15:2,15	entirely 31:15
76:3 78:21,22	dispensing 35:7	earlier 21:22	38:20 56:14	44:13 51:17
86:13	dispersed 25:16	22:10 58:17	60:20,23,25	73:10 81:14
differences 9:7	display 14:11	76:10	85:2 86:3	entities 11:3,15
different 6:10	66:10,12,15	eat 14:12 73:18	emits 15:2,15	12:3,4 16:5
6:25 21:8,21	dissatisfaction 49:10 59:9	effect 10:6 12:9	41:13	67:12 78:25
25:9 30:22	dissent 19:1	15:5 32:18	emitted 12:11	entitled 71:11
31:8,8,11,15	dissenting 9:2	69:1 81:18	17:24,25 32:19	entity 41:13
35:12,12,14,14	dissonant 76:18	effective 9:12	45:24,25 83:14	environmental
35:21 40:8,9	distinct 52:3	effects 10:2	emitter 58:2	1:6,13,22 2:5
47:2 49:17	distinction 30:19 72:17	13:22 16:22	emitters 34:11	2:12,20 5:5
51:5,6 59:20	distinctions 34:14,16	37:1 62:21	34:11 37:6,8	10:7 19:23
63:9 66:22	distinguish 37:5	73:17,22,25	39:10 40:17	62:18,19
73:6 81:14	37:7 60:6	74:1,4 83:7,8	43:15,20 60:6	EPA 5:14,21 7:8
89:1,13 90:9	distinguishable 80:17	83:12	61:2 85:13,16	7:21 11:4,21
90:21	distribute 87:2	efficiency 51:5	85:22,23	12:14,20 14:14
differently 20:3	disturb 84:11	88:21	emitting 29:14	16:12,15 17:17
21:21 45:10	doing 24:6,8	efficient 51:10	32:21,22 38:13	17:23 18:5,25
83:4	27:14 51:4	88:15 89:15	47:7 72:22	19:10,18,19
difficult 38:7	53:14 54:12	either 28:3	emphasize 72:16	20:15 21:2,2
difficulty 61:11	55:11 67:21	40:15 53:4	enacted 5:19,25	21:13 22:1,17
61:12	71:1	54:15 69:16,17	12:8 49:7,12	23:5,9,12,14
dilemma 17:8	domestic 51:9	76:4	55:2 70:10	24:16 26:10,19
dioxide 11:7	DONALD 3:9	Electric 19:11	71:17	27:16 28:14
41:14 42:21	4:9 45:19	46:1,22 72:13	enacting 40:19	32:7,13 33:10
58:3 62:6,9,13		elements 23:1	enactment 75:4	33:21,24 34:25
direct 20:15		eligible 47:7	encompass 21:6	35:2,4,7,13,19
		55:18,22	25:15	36:1,6,9,15,21
		EMC-Homer 83:9	encompassed 90:15	37:15 39:9,19
		emission 16:24	encompasses 67:18	40:5,7,23 41:5
		44:7 51:15	endangerment 10:1,3,4	41:11 42:7
		58:21 61:23	endorsing 75:24	43:19,20 45:8
				45:9 46:2,5,13
				46:20 49:12,13

49:16 51:18 53:5,13 54:24 55:4,24 56:22 57:4,5,13,14 59:25 60:2,8 60:10,13,16 61:5,17 62:3,4 62:17,20 64:8 65:12,16 66:19 67:5,17,17,24 68:18,19 72:4 72:14 73:13 74:10 76:13,15 77:25 78:4 79:6,9,20 80:6 81:4,6,8 82:6 82:14 83:10,23 84:2 85:10 86:4,14 89:25 EPA's 5:17 37:2 37:20 53:7,19 54:22 55:11 58:20 59:10 62:20 63:21 65:5 67:11,20 75:2 76:17 86:2 88:10 equally 13:5 17:8 29:10 equation 78:15 ESQ 3:5,7,9 4:3 4:6,9,12 essentially 17:1 34:15 44:8 72:4 78:13 79:25 85:22 86:14 establish 24:17 27:23 34:1 41:22 established 36:5 76:20 79:6 ET 1:10,14,19 1:23 2:2,6,9,13 2:17,21 evaluate 56:15 evaluation 48:5	eventually 10:24 11:5,22 everybody 16:14 17:21 64:25 73:22 evidence 40:19 40:20 evidences 68:23 evolving 50:14 exacerbate 10:5 exact 19:8 exactly 24:10,13 24:14 49:19 64:8 68:17,18 71:6 75:9,12 example 14:8 21:11 47:4 51:5 56:3 58:19 64:20 66:9 70:25 82:5,16 examples 65:11 89:6 exception 14:6 14:17 65:2 66:10 exceptional 90:7 exceptions 32:20 42:16,16,17 64:18,18 65:19 65:22,23 69:19 69:19 exclude 7:20 11:16 79:11 excludes 22:11 excluding 80:8 exclusion 79:5 exclusively 7:12 excuse 31:21 49:25 exempt 11:2 16:6 17:2 35:2 39:10 40:16,24 41:7 82:11 exemption 82:9 exemptions 11:11,13,14	exercise 87:19 90:12 existence 59:8 exists 68:1 expand 55:13 78:17 expanded 78:15 expanding 76:11 80:3 expansion 53:6 53:12 67:2 expansive 65:19 expectation 65:15 expectations 61:2 expected 76:25 expensive 57:23 explain 8:23 52:22 86:7 87:13 explains 13:14 explanation 62:3 express 9:14 14:22 extent 42:4,12 43:1 55:19 74:4 79:13 extra 28:8 84:5 extreme 20:12 20:14 22:6	88:18 fair 84:5 fairly 69:24,24 fairness 61:17 faithfully 78:8 families 52:23 far 62:20 67:5 fashion 46:16 FDA 44:16 90:17 FDA's 44:19 features 10:17 13:9,9 18:13 22:24 26:25 February 2:24 Federal 70:25 feels 64:10 felt 10:8 60:9 fifth 7:25 fight 52:14 figure 24:19 85:9 86:8 90:20 figuring 60:22 fill 49:24 filters 50:11 finally 36:9 90:9 find 32:20 47:5 47:22 63:5 80:15 finding 7:22 10:1,3,4 20:14 finds 64:9 finish 48:21 54:14 first 5:14 7:7 8:6 13:11 18:15 27:2 28:10 33:10 50:3 52:5,14 53:10 66:25 69:9 fit 23:3 38:2,6 five 61:10 84:5 fix 33:21 43:20 fixes 6:1 flexibility 69:18 flexible 35:11	39:19 flooding 74:2 floor 48:4,25 49:21 flow 65:25 focus 7:7 9:17 48:7 focused 7:13 13:7 25:19 30:23 69:7 74:20 75:8,12 folks 7:1 follow 16:11 17:13 77:13,13 follow-on 26:5 follow-up 7:25 62:8 followed 11:18 follows 48:19 Food 44:21 football 38:25 40:16 52:17,20 footnote 9:6 footprint 23:13 forbid 34:25 force 19:12 49:2 forced 36:13 foretold 44:13 form 43:21 forth 80:17 forum 32:3 found 18:16 60:25 64:8 FOUNDATION 2:1 four 6:25 Fourth 20:4 framework 79:7 friend's 79:24 fudge 17:3 full 75:6,8 fully 56:19 functions 89:2 fundamental 46:9,23 55:7 funds 71:9 further 45:15
---	---	--	---	--

87:25 90:25 future 6:5 62:24 83:25	55:3,7 56:1,11 57:2,10,18,24 58:16 59:5,15 59:18,23,23 60:15 61:7,16 62:11 63:13,20 64:7 65:4,12 65:18 66:24 68:4,6,17 69:23 70:1,3 70:17 71:4,15 72:11,14 73:4 73:24 74:9,14 75:5,7,18,21 76:2,6,9 77:4 77:15,21,24 78:14,24 79:3 79:21 80:20 81:2,9,21 84:7 84:15,23 85:1 85:15,19,24 86:6,22 87:8 87:11,17,23,25 88:2,7	giving 90:16 glad 81:21 global 23:20 24:24 27:13,13 54:17 globally 7:14 25:15 28:22 go 16:9 22:4 38:18 49:13 59:9 67:4 73:18 76:20 87:21 90:19 goal 55:12 goals 68:21 God 38:22 goes 6:19 18:2 28:2 49:6 55:9 62:25 66:25 67:10 going 8:8 11:22 16:2 17:2,3 18:22 26:3,22 28:3,4 34:19 38:8 39:1 54:8 54:18 55:5,15 55:23,25 56:8 57:15,21 59:6 60:21 62:12,14 63:14 66:6,16 70:23 71:25 75:10,12,16,18 77:22 78:16 79:1,17,18,19 84:11,19,19 85:6,8 89:11 89:12 good 54:10 57:22 86:25 87:6 goodness 58:12 gosh 60:9 gotten 49:17 84:11 government 28:9 government's 9:8 13:12	18:16 gradually 55:13 gravest 62:19 greater 12:12 51:24 62:24 greenhouse 1:18 6:24 7:9 9:5,17 10:2 12:6,9,11 12:21 16:16 20:8 22:18 23:3,12 26:12 27:23 28:11,22 29:2,13 32:25 33:16,20,23,25 36:25 38:1 39:6,9 42:12 43:17 45:14,23 46:3 47:17 50:13,16,22 52:5,8 54:25 58:20,22 61:4 61:9,15 63:11 63:19 64:10 67:6,12,18 68:13 69:2,4 69:11 70:7,10 72:9,19 73:25 74:5 77:25 78:4 81:15,18 83:3 84:12 88:20 ground-level 10:5 Group 1:3,18 5:5 guess 7:2 31:15 64:7 guide 85:8 gum 14:9,11 66:8,10	happen 78:16 happened 16:23 happens 81:11 83:19 happy 42:24 48:16,20 hard 32:2 57:1 harm 63:6 harms 46:7 hate 75:16 Haven 83:15 hazardous 74:23 health 45:24 hear 5:3 63:2 65:8 heard 27:19 hearing 11:19 18:20 heart 62:15 heck 9:7 held 21:5 22:19 26:10 35:16 42:5 72:13 help 10:16 48:13 helpful 9:12 50:17 58:2 65:11 87:11 high 11:6 41:19 52:17,20 highlight 22:25 historically 56:15 history 40:21 70:24 hold 19:19 38:1 holding 20:4,7 39:21 holds 34:2 hole 34:3 62:23 holes 34:2 Honor 7:4,11 8:7,21 9:11 12:17,22 15:11 17:7,8 19:6 21:11,25 22:14 23:24 24:7,15 28:16 29:5
<hr/> G <hr/> G 5:1 game 38:25 52:17,20 53:2 53:3 gas 1:18 28:2 38:1 46:3 50:16 52:8 58:21 67:6,19 77:25 78:4 gas-inclusive 43:18 gases 6:24 7:9 9:5,17 10:2 12:7,9,11,21 16:16 20:9 22:18 23:3,12 26:12 27:23 28:11,22 29:2 29:13 32:25 33:16,20,23,25 36:25 39:6,9 42:12 45:14,23 47:17 50:13,22 52:5 54:25 58:22 61:4,10 61:15 63:11,19 64:10 67:9,12 68:13 69:2,4 69:12 70:7,10 72:9,19 74:1,5 81:15,18 83:3 84:12 88:20 general 3:7,9 11:16 33:4 34:5 36:17 42:18 43:23 45:17,19,21 46:3,19 48:11 48:16,20 50:14 51:3,11,16 52:9,12,19 53:3 54:4,11	generally 21:7 generates 76:23 generations 62:24 83:25 getting 62:14 GHG 16:1 62:5 62:6,7 Ginsburg 9:1,25 20:23 22:9 32:6 62:2,12 75:25 76:4 77:2,5 79:15 86:4 give 7:8 8:2 22:3 26:22 46:13,13 56:3,22 60:11 61:23 70:25 71:13 81:19 given 33:11 43:24 44:6 46:15 61:22 77:7 89:7 gives 21:8	giving 90:16 glad 81:21 global 23:20 24:24 27:13,13 54:17 globally 7:14 25:15 28:22 go 16:9 22:4 38:18 49:13 59:9 67:4 73:18 76:20 87:21 90:19 goal 55:12 goals 68:21 God 38:22 goes 6:19 18:2 28:2 49:6 55:9 62:25 66:25 67:10 going 8:8 11:22 16:2 17:2,3 18:22 26:3,22 28:3,4 34:19 38:8 39:1 54:8 54:18 55:5,15 55:23,25 56:8 57:15,21 59:6 60:21 62:12,14 63:14 66:6,16 70:23 71:25 75:10,12,16,18 77:22 78:16 79:1,17,18,19 84:11,19,19 85:6,8 89:11 89:12 good 54:10 57:22 86:25 87:6 goodness 58:12 gosh 60:9 gotten 49:17 84:11 government 28:9 government's 9:8 13:12	<hr/> H <hr/> half 29:24 hand 54:24 55:4 handle 32:4 handled 82:6 hands 67:23	

30:3,18 31:7 31:21 32:10 35:1 39:25 50:15 60:16 73:5 88:9,10 89:17 Honor's 55:10 56:12 78:8 hopes 11:4 horns 17:7 hours 41:16 56:17 huge 52:16 62:13 Human 52:20 hundreds 41:15 83:12 hypothesis 60:22 hypothetical 71:13,16 88:9	64:17 65:1 implicitly 39:9 implied 57:20 import 22:3 importance 48:23 important 22:16 34:9 43:25 63:3,23 81:23 impose 41:12,16 41:18 56:23 57:6 83:12 85:4 imposing 33:22 incentive 24:18 include 45:13 63:17 66:12,15 76:22 included 9:18 20:8 44:17 79:12 includes 22:14 33:14 35:17 42:6 including 29:25 39:9 42:12 inclusion 76:23 inclusive 38:1,4 38:5 incompatible 33:19 inconsistent 90:18 incorporated 51:25 incremental 86:12,13 indefinite 6:5 indicated 25:17 28:19 individualized 11:19 individuals 86:20 industrial 41:17 88:24 inevitably 65:25	infinitesimal 13:2 inquiry 22:8 insisted 40:7 installed 9:4 institutions 79:1 instruction 88:11 intact 34:21 intelligible 84:18 intend 45:2 70:9 84:14 intended 16:5 intends 6:4 14:11 intent 5:19 11:8 interpret 17:11 36:1,2 69:17 interpretation 5:14,22 6:9 7:19 8:1,4,10 8:25 17:12,22 17:23 19:20 21:25 22:3 32:12,12 34:9 37:9,14 38:2,5 53:24 54:3,8 66:4,6,15,21 68:15 69:10,11 69:15 70:13,15 72:3 90:22 interpretations 6:11,25 8:9 36:15 66:11 68:9,11 interpretative 90:12 interpreted 21:3 21:13 45:9 53:22 66:1 76:13,13 interprets 36:3 36:6,10 interrupt 81:10 intervals 49:4 invalidation	53:18 invariably 32:19 32:21 involve 88:8 irrational 46:18 irreconcilable 16:25 44:9 isolation 18:4 44:19 issue 17:12 20:11 22:5 28:17 29:6,7 59:25 64:12 65:22,23 66:17 70:8 81:11 issued 50:16 issues 29:6 33:9 it'll 85:25	16:1,8,10,11 17:14 18:3,24 19:7,16 20:23 21:7,16,20 22:9 23:21,25 24:4,8 25:3,7 25:24 26:3,7 26:21 27:2,6 27:17 28:7,23 29:22,23 30:1 30:15,21 31:3 31:10,19,22 32:6 33:3,7 34:5,22 36:17 37:12,17,25 38:7,8,13,16 39:15 40:10 41:2,6,20 42:10,23 43:6 43:8,14,23 44:22,24 45:1 45:17,21 46:12 47:1 48:6,12 48:13,18 50:7 50:21 51:8,12 51:13 52:2,10 52:13 53:1,12 54:2,4,6,21 55:4,8,10,23 56:5,18 57:3 57:11,15,19,25 58:6,9,17,25 59:12,17,23,24 61:4,13 62:2 62:12 63:1,2 63:18,24 64:2 64:16 65:7,18 65:20 66:8 67:15 68:3,6,7 68:22 69:5,8 69:25 70:3,6 70:12,21 71:14 72:6 73:2,21 74:6,12 75:1,6 75:15,25 76:4 76:10 77:2,5 77:12,18,22
<hr/> I <hr/>			<hr/> J <hr/>	
idea 44:15 50:2 50:8 62:8 82:17 86:23 identical 30:20 identified 10:16 identifies 14:22 II 20:10,16,24 22:5 42:7 immediate 62:1 immediately 8:16 impact 7:23 10:10 23:8 impacts 7:14 9:24 13:8 18:10 23:14 25:1,16 27:9 27:12 28:20 implement 8:16 29:9 57:4 implementation 68:1 implicate 28:13 implicit 40:16			JONATHAN 3:7 4:6 33:5 JR 3:9 4:9 45:19 Judge 6:18 30:11,15,16 31:4 53:17 75:22 79:23 80:9 judgement 65:5 judges 9:3 judgment 62:20 64:13 judgments 71:11 junk 17:23 jurisdiction 23:19 44:20 90:17 Justice 3:10 5:3 5:10 6:8 7:16 7:17,24,25 8:12 9:1,21,25 10:12,18,20,22 11:9,13,20,24 12:5,16,22 13:24 14:25 15:17,20,23	

78:10,20,20,25 79:15 80:13,25 81:3,9,22 84:4 84:10,16,24 85:11,15,17,21 86:4,17,24 87:9,16,20,24 88:2,6 89:5 91:2 Justice's 70:13 justify 65:5	21:24 22:13 23:24 24:3,6 24:14 25:6,13 26:6,8,24 27:4 27:7,22 28:16 29:1,25 30:3 30:18,23 31:6 31:16,21 32:1 32:10 47:16 88:3,4,6 89:9 KENNEDY 19:7 21:20 48:6,13,18 71:14 72:6 77:22 80:13 Kennedy's 53:12 Kentucky 83:14 kicks 64:11 kind 10:9 16:24 17:24 34:8,19 44:7 50:18 59:20 60:4,7 88:8 89:14 kinds 25:15 51:5 51:6 71:22 74:1 knew 39:15 75:18 knock 54:18 know 14:19 16:17 24:9 25:10 28:9 31:23 38:11 50:11 52:17 54:6 60:4,8,17 62:16 64:19 68:22 75:7,15 75:22,23 78:18 81:21 85:24 86:20 88:10 knowledge 5:13 knows 73:22	language 13:20 25:5,13 30:22 30:24 31:11 34:4,6 39:22 39:24 40:1,11 40:15,20,23 42:18 47:14 67:16,18 large 11:6 12:25 41:17 43:9,10 65:15 86:11 largely 51:17 Laughter 19:4 26:2 32:5 39:16 58:5 70:5 74:8 75:20 76:8 84:9 law 64:23 65:10 87:14 lead 51:1 66:21 leads 85:12 learn 58:7 learned 58:2,6 leave 34:20 left 29:24 31:4 74:22 legal 2:1 31:14 legislative 68:9 lengthy 48:2 let's 16:8 19:8 22:4 49:22 60:19 63:5 64:2 letting 58:12 66:19 level 10:2,25 13:2 15:13,14 76:14 82:20,25 84:13,16,21 88:19 levels 29:14 74:2 74:6 83:1,15 licensed 46:16 light 51:10,12 88:10,12,15 lights 53:1,3	likes 71:3 limit 9:3 52:24 limitations 13:17 86:10 limited 8:8 28:19 73:9 limiting 46:3 line 19:8 51:23 54:15,17 61:1 lines 36:23 linked 47:23 list 25:25 literal 20:8,18 literally 21:5 litigants 75:16 little 15:1 65:2 73:16 local 6:21 9:22 10:2,8 18:21 22:20,21 23:8 23:10,17 24:21 24:25 25:21,22 27:8,10,15 47:10 54:17 73:10,17,21,25 74:1,4,5 81:16 82:2 83:19 88:11,13,25 localized 12:9 16:21 37:1 83:7 lock 50:4 longer 70:16 longstanding 36:15 37:9 look 16:12 17:1 22:4 23:12 34:18 38:16 40:20 50:13 55:17 58:8 60:2,19 82:7 82:25 85:1 88:14 looked 44:18 looking 18:4 47:8 55:18 83:19 85:22	looks 47:4 50:9 looseness 42:3 Los 73:22 lose 58:10 75:17 75:17 lot 6:10 7:2 9:7 58:7 59:7 80:22 86:1 lower 6:12 60:24
<hr/> K <hr/> Kagan 6:8 7:17 7:25 9:21 16:10 17:14 18:3 30:15,21 31:3,10 34:5 34:22 36:17 37:12 38:8 43:23 59:23 68:3,6 70:12 85:11,15,17,21 Kavanaugh 53:17 75:22 79:19 80:9 Kavanaugh's 6:18 79:23 Kavanaugh's 30:11,16,16 31:4 keep 16:12 49:3 49:22 keeping 25:25 37:8 Keisler 3:5 4:3 4:12 5:7,8,10 6:8 7:4,21 8:6 8:21 9:10,23 10:6,15,21 11:12,23,25 12:5,15,17 14:19 15:10,19 15:21,24 16:4 16:10 17:6 18:2 19:3,5,17 20:25 21:10,17	<hr/> L <hr/> lacks 46:5 67:6 lag 75:2			<hr/> M <hr/> main 9:5 51:4 56:3,3 Maine 83:16 major 30:13 34:11 35:2 37:6,7 38:13 40:24 43:15 47:7 50:1,20 58:24 60:6 61:2 78:12 85:7 making 31:7 45:8 67:5 86:12 man 41:15 managed 89:7 mandates 18:17 mandatory 23:11 manner 43:18 MANUFACT... 1:17 Mass 21:2 Massachusetts 18:5,25 19:10 19:18,19,22 20:6 22:1 26:4 26:5 33:13 35:15,16 37:19 39:21 42:6 44:23 45:5,10 67:17 68:19 70:19 74:7,10 76:15 89:19 Massachusetts's 36:11

<p>materially 12:25 materials 71:20 matter 3:1 11:21 52:23 91:5 maximizes 90:2 mean 6:20 7:18 12:6 13:25 14:13 16:23 17:15 20:1 21:4,13 24:9 34:12 35:14 36:1,2,4,7,7,10 36:21,21,23 38:25 39:1,3 40:8 43:9,14 44:2 50:24 53:22 56:21 59:4 63:10 64:19,22,25 66:8 68:12 69:6,25 70:1 71:12 73:22 76:14 78:11 81:23 83:8 86:23 89:24 meaning 17:19 53:20 77:10 meanings 35:12 means 6:18,21 36:18 37:13 38:10,23 39:5 39:8 42:25 43:4 58:3 60:20 85:2 86:2 90:21 meant 6:16 11:16 36:21 measurable 10:9 10:13,14 15:7 measure 69:1 measured 68:25 measures 13:17 20:13 22:7 mechanically 20:20 mechanism 24:20</p>	<p>meet 23:16 24:19 47:10,12 50:5 59:21 72:24 77:9 89:15 mejust 81:10 members 52:23 mention 22:24 89:24 mentioned 26:25 merely 28:21 metric 41:25 miles 83:12 million 15:3 56:21 86:19 millions 16:5 57:7 mind 12:8 38:10 58:15 69:7 minimum 15:17 minor 34:11 37:6,8 60:6 minutes 28:8 29:24 30:2 84:5 88:3 misconception 55:8 missing 87:10 mist 79:9 82:23 mists 82:4,17 83:4 misunderstan... 46:10 Mitchell 3:7 4:6 33:4,5,7 34:22 37:11,24 38:12 38:15 39:13,17 40:22 41:5,10 42:19 43:4,12 43:16 44:14,24 45:4,18 mixed 28:2 mobile 20:24 22:10 46:14 modification 35:25 50:2</p>	<p>modifications 25:4 modify 40:11 moment 51:16 Monday 2:24 money 87:5 monitoring 81:16 82:8,11 Montana 73:23 month 14:10 months 83:10 morning 5:4 Morton 71:6,15 80:24 motor 20:11 multiple 20:25 70:24 81:24,24 Muskie 40:14 49:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>N 4:1,1 5:1 NAAQ 63:15,19 NAAQS 6:16,18 6:20,22 27:21 27:23 28:5 30:17,17 32:7 32:9,14 47:11 50:10,24 51:1 54:15 63:8,14 63:15,16,25 72:22 76:21 79:7 82:10 narrow 42:11,11 55:21 narrowed 42:7 narrower 30:8 national 23:13 23:15 24:17 26:14 27:16,24 59:16 72:15 82:1,3 nationwide 47:16 48:4 natural 16:20 nature 83:20 89:13</p>	<p>necessarily 67:18 necessary 11:11 13:17 22:8 need 12:19 30:6 43:22 45:10 52:22 58:13 84:21 88:14 needed 22:4 needs 45:4 89:1 neither 37:18 net 52:21 58:2 neutral 52:21 never 16:2 26:7 33:24 55:23 57:21 83:20 new 16:24 17:24 22:14 34:19 44:7 50:1 57:16 60:7 64:6 74:18,24 75:11 83:15 nicotine 38:4 44:17 90:15 non-greenhouse 67:9 non-NAAQS 79:8 80:6 82:16 normally 65:3 notice 23:5 24:16 26:15 27:19 47:23 notion 65:19 85:4 notwithstandi... 31:13 39:20 NSPS 22:24,25 23:4,12 26:11 35:23 49:1,7 89:2,14 nuance 56:12 number 12:24 17:16 25:9 56:20 60:24 67:2 85:9,12 85:13,22 86:5</p>	<p>86:11 numbers 17:3 17:25 18:3 34:10,15,18,20 36:19 37:4 44:8 55:21 60:5,7 66:19 70:22,23 71:2 71:3 numerical 5:24 41:22 numerous 42:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <hr/> <p>O 4:1 5:1 objection 24:4 objective 61:3 obligation 53:7 53:13 56:23 61:18,19,20 71:8,18 72:18 76:23 78:16 80:3 obligations 67:20 71:22 84:1 85:5 obvious 43:24 obviously 37:2 43:2 44:2 53:5 71:4 75:23 odd 34:8 oh 26:6 54:7 60:9 Ohio 83:14 Okay 25:7 38:16 39:7 64:2,22 86:25 old 50:4 once 29:19 48:2 one's 87:6 one-time 6:2 ongoing 6:6 opened 19:16 opening 9:12 operate 28:25 46:11 operating 56:17</p>
--	--	---	---	---

operation 47:24 48:22 88:24	pace 49:10	25:12	3:6,8 4:4,7,13	please 5:11 33:8 45:22
opinion 19:20 23:21 57:17,20 79:24 80:19	page 4:2 13:12 41:1 47:5,22	performance 22:14 36:4 47:13,14,18	5:9 7:5 9:14 33:6,10 46:4 46:23 52:16 67:4 81:13 88:5	plugged 20:20
opinions 6:12 81:5	pages 18:16 50:19	permissible 34:24 39:21 42:20 66:20	phase 36:12	point 10:8,9 22:16 25:24 26:9,23 28:10 31:18 33:15 48:21 49:2,5 49:18 51:13,21 55:6 56:10,11 57:12 60:15 61:8 64:4 71:6 76:17 77:23 86:9,24 87:12 89:16
opportunities 27:19	parallel 12:18	permission 33:1	phenomena 7:14	points 25:25 26:22 66:24 73:6
opposed 50:25 51:14	parameter 90:5	permit 29:7,17 32:16 38:17 39:1,3 41:15 47:7 55:18 56:23 59:4 61:19 64:12 65:10 67:1,2,8 67:13 72:18,21 73:8 77:9 78:2 87:22	phenomenon 10:7	pollutant 6:10 6:16,16,19,21 6:21,22,23 15:5 16:18,19 16:21 17:11,16 17:17 18:6 19:20,21 20:7 20:19,21 21:1 21:4,12,14 30:13,17 32:14 32:14,15,16 33:11,14 34:15 34:16,19 35:11 35:13,16,21,24 36:7,8,10,11 36:12,14,18,20 36:22 37:9,13 37:13,14 38:2 38:21 39:5,6,8 39:18 40:8 42:5,11,14,22 42:22,25 43:1 43:17 45:3,5,9 45:13 49:11 50:4 53:21,22 59:10,10 60:3 60:4,8 61:5,14 63:12,15,16 64:1,3,6 67:16
opposite 55:16 60:18	part 22:8 30:24 30:25 35:22,24 49:8 58:3,14 59:18 62:13,16	permits 11:16 23:12,14 28:25 50:15 61:21 80:7 89:6	phrase 6:9 17:11 36:6,10 37:12 45:13 53:20 68:11	
options 7:11 51:23 53:15,16 79:17	particular 13:6 13:7 20:1 22:1 22:23 31:2 37:1 55:22 63:6,10 78:1 82:19 90:11	permitted 26:1 27:19	phrased 72:25	
oral 3:1 4:2,5,8 5:8 33:5 45:19	particularly 14:1	permitting 5:24 11:4 12:24 16:6 18:18 22:21,22 23:10 23:17 24:21,25 25:22 27:10,15 35:8 36:5 41:23 46:5 52:7 53:6,8,13 54:19 55:13 57:6 76:11,23 78:16 80:3 81:14 82:15 88:11,13,25	phrases 16:21 17:19,22,24	
order 11:15 12:20 24:23 47:6 80:2	particulate 51:15	person 40:13	pick 6:14 64:2 80:1 84:21 85:12,14	
orders 86:7	parts 21:22 35:14 40:9 42:8	persons 86:19	pieces 53:8	
original 6:15,17 32:12	party 3:6 4:4,13 5:9 7:5 88:5	persuaded 30:7	place 14:16 24:2 24:13 49:17,19 83:11	
originally 90:21	passage 62:21	pervasive 88:23	places 14:18 20:25 35:21 50:18 72:1 74:3,3	
ought 80:11	passes 14:2 83:24	PETER 3:5 4:3 4:12 5:8 88:4	plain 46:2,20 77:13	
outcome 40:5	pay 64:21	Petitioner 1:4	plan 77:18	
outrageous 89:12	payoff 88:17	Petitioners 1:11 1:20 2:3,10,18	planet 10:7	
outstanding 10:19	pegs 34:2		plant 22:22,23 23:18,18,19 24:22 45:25 89:3	
overall 82:20	people 8:15 10:8 13:22 38:23 39:2 41:7 55:21 56:19 57:14 78:23 79:1 89:7,15		plant's 88:16,24	
overburden 8:17	perceived 90:6		plants 23:16 24:18 25:1 46:4 49:14 58:21 78:2	
overlap 31:14	percent 9:7 52:8 52:11,15 53:11 56:25 58:9,10 58:11,11 64:21 68:4 78:21,21 78:22 86:15		plausible 27:11 41:16 45:12 68:10,14 70:13 70:14	
oversimplified 50:12	perfect 24:24			
ozone 7:18 10:5 73:19				
ozone-depleting 73:15 74:11,18 74:19,21 75:3 75:9 82:23 83:5				
P				
P 5:1				

68:12,12,20 72:19,22 73:1 76:12,22 77:9 77:16 89:20,20 89:22 90:10 pollutants 7:18 9:4 12:7,12 15:1,8 17:3 18:7,9 21:4,19 25:15 30:17 31:1 32:18,23 33:17 36:3,4 36:25 47:17 51:24 54:15,16 54:17,18 63:4 63:16,25 72:23 73:10 74:24 76:21 79:8,8 80:5,6 81:13 81:24 83:14,17 pollution 13:21 27:20 67:24 74:23 83:15 pollution-caus... 50:5 population 71:9 71:10 port 71:19 portion 30:22 portrayed 60:17 pose 45:23 position 6:15,17 6:18,19,23 8:24 9:13 15:11,13 28:13 30:11,12,16,17 30:19,20 54:23 56:6 79:16 80:16,19 possible 37:14 possibly 69:1 potential 15:15 38:20 56:14 potentially 88:23 power 35:7 45:25 46:1,4	46:22 49:14 58:21 72:13 78:1 powers 90:5 practical 32:17 61:25 practices 49:3 pre-Massachu... 70:15 precedent 14:20 80:15 precisely 14:21 58:13 preferred 25:10 premise 8:9 46:23 prepared 42:15 prescribe 46:2 72:14 prescribing 35:1 present 9:13 53:7 presented 5:12 7:2 presidential 17:18 pretty 57:1 79:3 prevail 52:4 Prevailing 52:10 prevent 13:18 prevention 13:15 18:10 25:18 27:4 previously 54:16 54:20 79:12 principal 7:6 9:16 principle 84:18 87:4 private 3:6 4:4 4:13 5:9 7:5 9:14 88:5 probably 88:16 problem 6:1 8:22 10:23 11:12 13:1 17:20 23:7	27:13 33:21 40:7 43:11,12 43:21 47:3 52:16 53:4,14 53:15 54:14 56:25 59:6,21 59:21 61:8 62:1,14,15,18 62:19 64:24 65:1,7 67:25 68:1 76:10 79:14 80:4,10 81:7,8 83:24 83:25 86:18 problematic 6:3 60:13 76:17 79:6 problems 12:18 13:21 46:17 47:2 53:15 63:22 70:19 proceeded 90:10 proceedings 65:14 81:4 process 11:4 16:6 18:18 50:15 81:14 88:20 processes 51:6 82:15 produce 20:12 22:6 66:1,5 produces 46:16 66:6 program 5:17 7:12 9:18 13:6 13:7,14,16 15:4 22:15,19 22:23,24,25 23:1,1,2 25:8 25:12,14 28:13 29:3 35:23 43:18 46:6,10 47:2,21,25 49:1,7,8,18,25 55:1,2 56:7 58:18 59:8,11	59:20 63:24 68:21 71:12 72:16 73:9,14 74:21,25 75:4 79:10 80:8 81:12,25 82:25 83:18,20 89:2 89:14 90:8 programs 7:8 13:6 22:9 29:4 33:17,19 34:1 38:4 45:12 76:20 90:17 promise 13:2 promulgate 26:19 proper 33:23 79:15 84:22 proposed 32:11 proposing 79:2 Protection 1:6 1:13,22 2:5,12 2:20 5:5 provide 71:8,10 72:12 provided 42:3,4 provision 13:13 16:18 18:7 19:25 21:18 23:22 24:11,11 26:11 29:12,17 29:18 30:25 35:4,23 36:13 40:3,5 41:4,9 41:11 48:1,2 56:22 67:7,11 69:12,15,18 70:22 87:14 provisions 5:16 5:23 8:11 20:11,16,22 21:12 22:5 26:17 28:19 34:24 38:3 50:24 51:2 54:9 66:7 67:7 70:11	PSD 5:14 7:9,12 9:18 10:11,17 13:9,14,14 15:4 18:4 21:12 22:11,23 23:1,2,18 24:20 25:14 26:17,25 28:13 28:18,25 29:3 30:10,25 32:16 33:17,25 36:5 38:3 41:2 43:18 45:12 46:5,10 47:2,7 47:21,25 49:8 49:18,23,25 54:25 58:17 59:4,8,14,20 59:22 62:4 63:24 67:12 69:12 72:15,18 72:21 73:9,14 74:21,25 75:3 76:21 79:10 80:7 81:12,25 82:25 83:18 88:20 public 18:20 45:24 publish 63:7,18 pull 74:20,23 purpose 15:11 68:10 purposes 33:14 33:17 34:21 35:18 42:7 43:18,25 68:14 put 17:20 25:9 36:19 38:9 40:14 49:19 57:9,21 58:25 59:1,7 69:11 87:5 putting 18:25 52:14 <hr/> Q <hr/>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>quality 7:13,23 9:24 10:10 13:8,18,20 18:10,12,21 25:1,20 27:25 43:9 47:10 50:23 63:7 68:24 69:1 73:11 82:1,3,4 82:20 85:7 quantities 32:19 43:9,10,11 quantity 12:10 12:12 question 8:25 10:19 16:11 17:10 18:6 19:7 22:2 24:10 28:9 31:20,23 34:9 35:10 36:18,19 37:18 40:11 41:21 43:23,25 44:1 47:1 52:25 53:12 54:21,22 55:10 56:13,22 57:3 57:8 58:1 59:24 63:3 65:9,9,24 66:23,25 67:3 67:10 72:17 73:3 75:16,19 78:6,8 81:11 questions 45:15 69:8 73:9 88:1 90:25 quick 81:11,19 quintessential 8:2 quite 58:7 66:22 69:6 71:5 75:13 81:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>R 5:1 radioactive</p>	<p>71:20 raise 74:2 raised 81:22 raises 16:14 67:3 raising 49:3,22 rang 87:1 ratification 75:14 ratified 74:15 rationales 31:14 rays 73:20 reach 28:14 43:20 89:12 read 11:9,10 14:6,17 42:15 48:9 57:20,23 65:22,23 76:22 79:23 reading 22:2 27:18 46:8 48:1,6,8 65:19 67:16 68:11 78:11 79:2 80:10,13,14 readings 16:20 80:2 readjust 6:4 reads 68:19 real 61:8 realistic 60:21 reality 61:22 realize 7:1 really 6:13,23 12:5,18 16:11 17:14 26:24 38:25 51:11 56:24 60:9 61:12 62:14,15 62:24 63:21 65:18 67:22 68:5 69:13 73:6 74:5 87:6 89:23 reason 5:22 11:1 24:5 34:22 37:3 39:13,17</p>	<p>58:16 59:7,18 62:11 79:4,5 86:25 87:18 reasonable 8:8 8:11 16:20 17:4,21,23 46:8 72:2 84:2 reasoning 19:10 57:6 reasons 25:17 28:19 67:13 68:13 80:17 rebuttal 4:11 29:25 30:2 87:15 88:4 recognizable 56:10 recognize 9:11 recordkeeping 41:3,9,11 redefining 79:11 reducing 23:13 reexamine 5:22 refer 18:8 reference 30:5 references 34:7 referred 18:11 referring 12:23 34:6 68:8 refers 13:15 18:8 refineries 49:15 58:23 reflected 20:17 reflects 8:22 refused 35:19 regard 23:13 regime 33:22 region 13:19,20 18:12 25:20 81:19 regional 27:25 regionally-def... 10:10 13:22 regulate 7:9 12:3,3 13:2 22:17,22 46:6</p>	<p>46:13,14,21 52:3 58:10,11 61:18 63:9,22 64:11 65:2 67:12 70:10 75:3 83:17 regulated 6:23 14:4 21:13 28:11 29:14 36:3,8,22 37:13 39:6 43:5 44:16 50:10,20 52:6 54:16 64:3,5 65:3,16 70:8 72:23 75:10,13 80:6 81:25 82:10 84:12,17 89:21 regulates 79:10 regulating 8:15 52:17 61:2 73:13 74:11 83:11 regulation 1:19 6:7 16:19 17:17 23:7 28:14 29:9,12 33:19 50:25 53:23 64:1 69:4 70:25 72:9 73:1 77:10,17 82:7 regulations 26:18 49:11 65:13 82:7 regulatory 1:3 5:5 7:22 14:1 19:12,12 33:25 52:16 68:21 76:20 79:7 90:18 rejected 44:15 44:19 rejecting 79:16 related 82:10 relates 46:25</p>	<p>51:14 relating 50:10 relationship 49:6 relatives 39:2 released 73:18 relied 81:3 relief 88:19 remainder 33:2 remaining 62:7 remand 37:21 remember 49:25 58:8 remind 83:8,22 reply 9:9 80:17 require 23:2,7,8 43:19 53:18 59:3,14 61:19 64:14 80:7 81:16 required 18:19 25:20 27:8 28:25 89:19 requirement 13:5 38:6 41:3 48:15 49:19 54:19 55:14 61:22 72:25,25 76:11 82:12,13 82:16 requirements 29:8 30:10 32:17 33:18 35:3 42:3 43:19 44:20 47:11 56:23 57:7 83:6 requires 8:10 20:3 51:24 64:21 68:24 82:8 reserve 28:6 33:2 resort 43:21 resources 71:23 84:21 87:3 respect 16:16</p>
--	---	---	--	--

21:10 27:12 28:12,24 44:4 50:9,13 52:6 52:24,24 54:12 60:3 63:11 64:9 67:14,23 68:1 72:15 74:10 76:20 82:15,22,23 90:9 respects 5:13 Respondents 3:11 4:10 45:20 50:19 responding 85:6 response 33:23 81:20 responsible 60:1 rest 34:20 restaurant 41:19 rests 46:9 result 5:17 19:9 31:9 48:18 results 20:13,15 25:16 40:4 53:25 67:22 return 41:20 reverse 37:21 44:23 reversed 20:4 revise 54:8 revision 53:19 revisit 45:5 rewrite 8:11 13:1 26:12 55:12 61:24 66:19 rewrites 39:25 rewriting 5:23 6:2 26:18 28:18 34:4 35:7 rewritten 8:13 23:2 rewrote 10:24 29:16,18	rifle 79:13 right 6:13 8:20 8:21 10:14,15 11:21,23 12:15 12:17 15:10,19 15:21,23 16:4 16:8 19:5 21:16 23:24,25 25:6,8 27:6 29:1 30:18,23 38:11,15 40:10 40:25 42:10 43:4 48:14 50:21,22,25 51:7 52:19 55:2 57:18,25 58:6 59:17 68:7 69:5,22 70:16 73:3,23 77:21 79:22,22 80:23 81:23 84:13 85:18 86:8 87:23 rigid 41:22 risen 74:7 risk 72:1 76:19 80:8 road 55:6 56:9 ROBERTS 5:3 10:18 18:24 28:7,23 29:23 30:1 33:3 45:17 50:7,21 51:8,13 52:2 52:10,13 53:1 63:1,18 64:2 73:2,21 77:12 77:18 80:25 84:4,10,16,24 88:2 91:2 round 34:1,3 Ruiz 71:6,15 80:24 rule 29:10 62:3 68:7 rulemaking 23:6 24:16 26:16	65:13 81:4,4 86:7 rules 25:9 46:3 63:16 ruling 33:13 <hr/> S <hr/> S 4:1 5:1 save 12:20 saying 9:6 11:10 11:10,21 16:12 16:15 17:22 18:25 22:11 24:1 27:14 31:24,25 36:24 43:14,16 44:20 45:1 54:7 55:11,16 57:12 61:17 72:7,7 72:10 78:19 says 6:20,23 11:4,17 13:16 14:15,20,24 16:18,18 21:12 25:3,18,18 29:17,18 35:1 38:17,19 42:25 47:12 48:1,2 49:22 54:24 55:4 57:14 76:14 77:7 78:3 82:7 88:13 90:22 Scalia 10:12 11:9,13,20,24 25:24 26:3,7 26:21 27:2,6 42:23 43:6 46:12 54:2,5,6 55:10 65:18 67:15 68:7,22 69:9,25 70:6 74:6 Scalia's 70:13 scene 32:25 school 38:23 41:19 52:17,20	schools 11:6 science 64:4 scientists 51:19 scope 67:10 78:15,17 89:13 scrubbers 50:11 sea 74:2,6 search 71:19,25 searched 71:24 second 5:21 25:24 27:7 30:4,8 33:15 52:11 89:16 section 13:11 18:15 21:8 22:15,19 25:9 26:11 35:22 36:9 40:25 46:22,25 47:1 47:5,19,24 48:3 72:23 77:8 see 14:12 24:4 39:10 42:14 43:9 47:3,6 60:20 69:6 77:7,11 83:19 87:24 seek 72:8 seize 35:5 selectiveness 89:25 selectivity 89:17 self-help 43:22 Senate 40:13,18 Senator 40:14 49:7 sense 14:4,7,16 14:18 20:8 24:24 43:15,17 49:24 57:5 71:7 81:15,17 82:2 sensible 33:19 34:17 37:8 67:22 sensibly 42:13	43:1 separate 21:14 29:5,20 34:11 separation 90:5 serious 67:24 set 47:15 48:3 59:15 77:25 80:17 85:21 86:16 89:14 sets 15:14 49:1 setting 58:20 86:16 89:2 settle 86:5 severe 10:2 sharp 88:19 short 75:2 shot 79:13 show 13:10 47:10 shown 45:9 shows 90:2 side 7:1 8:1,3 19:1 significance 19:12 significant 13:15,18 18:11 25:19 27:5 51:4 53:6,15 53:19,19 58:22 63:22 70:19 72:8 74:22 76:2 86:10 similar 30:19 31:6 59:25 65:11 simple 40:2 82:17,21 simply 10:23 11:21 38:2 66:18 single 6:2 17:19 80:15 89:10 site 18:21 sitting 40:12 situated 17:8 situation 5:12
--	--	--	--	---

62:17 72:20	sources 7:9	90:14	statutory 6:2	91:5
80:23 82:18	12:11,25 22:18	State 3:8 4:7	11:1 12:14	subsection 23:9
83:19 88:8	23:6 26:13	22:20,21 23:10	16:13,15,17	47:9 48:6
situations 34:3	28:12,24 41:17	23:17 24:20,24	18:17 19:25	subset 13:21
six 9:11 15:6	46:4,7,14,15	25:22 27:10,14	23:22 25:13	21:4
61:9	46:15,21 49:18	33:6 50:18	26:18 30:22	substance 28:22
size 34:12 56:24	50:9 52:6	82:25 88:11,13	31:11 33:18	29:2 63:6
slightly 31:8	54:18 58:24	88:25	34:4,6,9,24	substances
small 11:3,15	60:24 62:5,7,7	stated 69:8	35:12 37:16,19	73:15,16,17
12:3,3,24	65:15 67:8	states 1:1 2:17	39:22 40:1,3,5	74:11,18,19,21
39:10 43:11,20	68:5 86:11,12	3:2 25:2 69:23	41:1 42:20	75:3,9 82:9,16
57:8 86:11	SOUTHEAST...	69:24 71:20	46:9 47:4	82:24 83:5
smaller 86:1	2:1	80:14 82:14	54:24 55:19,24	substantial 67:5
smog 10:5 73:22	specific 16:13	stationary 7:9	56:2,7,9 61:6	74:16
smoke 88:22	28:17 41:25	22:18 46:4,15	61:10,21,25	substantially
snails 64:22	70:22 82:9	46:15,21 78:1	64:11 67:16,20	55:21
so-called 67:3	specifically	statute 8:2,25	70:21	substituted
Solicitor 3:7,9	10:16 11:17	10:11 11:14,17	step 37:22	12:16
7:23 88:7	19:24 22:5	12:1,20,23	stop 20:9	sufficient 32:16
solution 60:10	34:25 35:5	13:3,4,9 14:2,8	stratosphere	90:24
79:13	47:18,23 74:17	15:7,14 16:25	73:18	sufficiently
something's	75:9	18:4,11,13	streamlining	20:19
61:23	specificity 72:12	20:2 21:23	8:18 57:17	suggest 58:17
sorry 6:8 10:18	specifics 50:18	26:25 27:24	86:23	suggested 62:5
25:18 59:12	specifies 13:13	30:10,12 31:12	stripe 35:18	78:11
63:1 85:15	square 34:2,4	32:13 34:20	strong 75:14	suggests 21:17
sort 7:18 9:10	stacks 88:23	35:4 37:5,23	stronger 40:6	suit 87:14,18,22
51:6,7,8 54:13	staff 40:13	38:24 39:12	strongly 80:15	sulfuric 79:9
56:21 87:9	standard 23:15	41:22 42:9,13	structure 25:14	82:4,17,22
sorts 46:17	36:4 47:13,13	43:2 44:5,9,17	28:5 31:12	83:4
Sotomayor 7:16	47:14,19 48:3	51:24 54:3,9	90:18	sum 81:6
7:24 8:12	48:4 49:12,21	61:18 64:18,20	study 25:20 27:7	summation
10:20 12:23	49:23 59:16,22	65:20,25,25	27:8	81:10 84:8
14:25 15:17,20	63:17 78:1	66:4,8,11,20	stuff 88:22	supports 80:15
15:23 16:1,8	82:11	66:21 68:11,14	subject 9:19	suppose 40:14
21:7,16 27:17	standards 22:14	68:23 69:4	15:16 16:19	66:9
31:19,22 37:17	24:17 25:3	70:11,15 71:2	17:12,16 19:15	supposed 22:22
37:25 41:2,6	26:15 27:25	71:17 72:4	29:11 52:7	34:11,12,13,14
44:22,25 45:1	47:11,15,16,18	77:14,16,19	53:22 64:1	46:11 48:24
59:12,17 75:15	47:24 49:1,17	79:25 82:8	66:11 67:13	49:23 51:25
78:10,20,25	55:17 57:13,16	84:18 90:4,11	72:21 73:1,8	58:18 70:6
89:5	58:20,21 59:1	90:15,23	76:7 77:8,9,17	Supreme 1:1 3:2
source 22:14	59:2,3 72:15	statutes 5:15,16	81:12 87:18	sure 19:17 23:22
35:3 38:20	82:2,4,5 86:16	5:23 13:25	subjected 54:19	50:11 59:13
40:24 49:13	89:3,15	42:17 64:17	submission	82:18 85:11
50:3 59:10,10	start 8:9	70:14	89:10	surrounding
60:23 78:1	started 48:14	statutorily 71:11	submitted 91:3	37:16

<p>sustain 80:19 sustainable 58:4 sustaining 80:21 sweep 57:13 sweeping 86:10 system 24:18 61:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>T 4:1,1 tailoring 29:10 tailpipe 45:25 take 7:18 14:14 14:21 28:8 34:5 53:8 54:14 59:6 60:15 62:10 66:8 79:18 taken 66:18 71:2 takes 14:14 talk 53:10,12 90:3 talked 73:15 talking 11:14 23:23 38:11 41:8 52:3 74:4 88:18 team 40:16 technologies 51:18,20,21 technology 9:20 15:3,12 28:21 29:8,19 38:18 47:21,25 48:5 48:25 50:5,6,8 50:13 51:22,22 72:24 88:22 tell 37:21 87:12 87:15 tells 14:2 tend 85:6 tens 57:7 term 16:13,15 16:17 18:6 19:25 20:1 22:1 33:11 34:8 35:10,20</p>	<p>35:23 39:18 terms 5:17 16:25 44:9 72:25 76:10 77:7 82:7 83:7 88:17 testing 82:2 Texas 2:9 3:8,8 text 46:9 47:4 77:13 thank 10:21 30:3 33:3 45:17 84:3 88:1,2,6 91:1,2 theory 9:8 thing 17:19 21:18 24:10,15 26:21 37:3 44:6,11 49:16 49:16,16 51:4 51:4,7,9 58:8 64:23 73:13 74:17 84:6 things 14:4 17:4 32:8 33:14 35:14,17 36:2 36:7,12 38:19 40:8 42:6 57:11 62:2 65:2 73:5 79:9 79:11 82:22,23 85:8 86:17 90:5 think 8:24 10:3 12:18 13:10,12 14:6 16:20 17:14,20 18:3 18:14,16 19:15 20:17 21:24 22:13 23:19 24:22 25:11,14 27:1,11,14,23 28:16,20 31:13 31:19,22,23 32:4 34:23 36:17 37:11 38:8,9 39:20</p>	<p>40:13,18,22 42:20 44:14 46:20,22 48:23 50:8 51:12 53:4 54:9,12 56:12 57:10 59:19,19 60:16 60:18 61:16,23 62:11 63:3,20 64:4 65:11 66:22 68:18 69:8,23,24,25 70:3 71:6 72:1 72:1,2,11 73:5 73:11 74:14 75:13,13,21 76:14,25 77:1 77:6,21 78:9 78:15 79:4,4 79:12,22 80:16 80:22,24 81:23 84:1,12,17,23 85:3,9,19,24 85:25 86:1,8 86:22 87:17 88:9 90:4,12 90:24 thinking 53:14 80:4,11 thinks 33:21 57:5 79:14 third 27:9 32:3 thought 30:16 55:24 57:3,8 58:4 68:20 75:1 76:7 thousands 57:7 78:23,23 83:12 threat 45:23 62:24 83:25 three 10:17 13:8 13:9 26:25 29:23 32:20 35:21 48:9,11 73:6 threshold 12:14 12:14 32:19</p>	<p>56:2 63:9 thresholds 5:25 6:5 10:24 11:1 11:2,7 13:1 14:22,24 23:5 26:13,19 28:18 35:8 36:6 41:23 54:25 55:24 56:7,9 61:6,11,25 64:5 throw 14:9 throwing 67:23 time 8:18 14:12 19:21 29:21 33:2 42:18,22 45:16 49:14 59:7,9 62:21 64:17 74:22 75:2 times 60:14 tiny 40:17 57:21 65:2 Title 5:15 20:10 20:16,24 21:12 22:5 33:15,17 34:1 35:3,8,18 36:5 38:3 40:25 41:2,3,7 41:15 42:7 43:5 45:12 56:20 62:4 74:19 86:18 tobacco 38:4 44:16 90:17 today 10:4 24:2 told 23:9 84:7 ton 15:14 tonnage 48:15 tons 14:15 17:9 29:15 32:22 38:20 41:13,24 41:24 56:14 60:20,25 61:20 65:14 77:19,20 85:2 86:3 89:23</p>	<p>totally 87:21 trade 54:10 train 64:21 transform 54:25 transition 55:12 55:13 treated 17:19 21:21 33:16 treating 12:2 83:3 treats 29:20 tremendous 87:1 tried 27:22 29:5 58:17 86:6 trigger 9:19 15:14 32:16 67:14 69:15,17 76:14 77:5,6 78:7 79:11 80:7,21 triggered 30:12 triggering 30:10 67:11 73:7 triggers 67:1 72:17,20 80:10 troubling 90:7 true 17:15 32:10 41:5 51:17,17 70:17 81:3 90:24 try 10:25 11:10 53:8,11 55:8,9 56:2 61:1 65:14 71:12 81:17 83:1 86:8 trying 26:14 44:16 51:19 57:11 60:5,17 60:18,19 63:22 67:25 78:8 80:11 82:18 85:4,8,10 86:15 turbines 51:6 turn 9:9 19:18</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>30:4 turned 89:25 turns 14:3 47:20 two 5:13 7:6 9:15 12:18 16:25 17:4,7,7 18:13 26:22 32:2,20 33:9 39:4,8,24 44:9 48:22 49:6 50:18 52:3 53:8 57:11 66:11,24 69:7 86:17 type 34:14,16 35:6 typical 85:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>ultraviolet 73:20 unambiguous 5:24 17:10 33:18 34:4,6 38:3,6 39:25 40:3,4 42:2 43:19 44:20 45:6 77:7 89:18 unambiguously 18:14 20:8 35:17 37:13 42:6 89:19 undefined 18:6 underlying 85:3 understand 8:13 8:14 17:15 28:23 54:23 56:6 60:8 63:24 85:12 understandable 60:2 understanding 52:7 53:7,20 62:17 68:19 86:2 understood 20:18 21:2</p>	<p>59:13 79:24 undertook 74:16 undifferentiat... 7:14 uniform 23:15 33:12 45:6 United 1:1 2:17 3:2 71:20 unnecessarily 65:24 unprecedented 5:13 unreasonable 46:13 89:11 unrecognizable 5:18 55:1 56:7 unthinkable 69:13,13 70:1 70:4,7,8,9 unusual 83:10 unwritten 14:17 69:19 urgency 62:16 urgent 62:18 81:8 83:24 usage 50:25 use 7:15 24:1 38:17 46:5 48:24 61:10 63:14 67:12 uses 51:9 57:13 utility 1:3 5:4 50:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>v 1:5,12,21 2:4 2:11,19 5:5,15 18:5,25 19:11 19:18,18,19,23 21:2,12 22:1 22:16 26:8,16 38:3 40:25 41:2,3,7,15 43:5 45:12 56:20 62:4 67:17 68:19 71:6,15 76:15</p>	<p>80:24 86:18 vacate 37:21 various 6:11 vehicles 20:11 20:24 22:10 Verrilli 3:9 4:9 45:19,21 46:19 48:11,16,20 50:14 51:3,11 51:16 52:9,12 52:19 53:3 54:4,11 55:3,7 56:1,11 57:2 57:10,18,24 58:16 59:5,15 59:18 60:15 61:7,16 62:11 63:13,20 64:7 65:4,12,18 66:24 68:4,17 69:23 70:2,3 70:17 71:4,15 72:11 73:4,24 74:9,14 75:5,7 75:18,21 76:2 76:6,9 77:4,15 77:21,24 78:14 78:24 79:3,21 80:20 81:2,21 84:7,15,23 85:1,15,19,24 86:6,22 87:8 87:11,17,23,25 version 37:2 versus 24:19 54:15 72:20 73:23 83:8 VI 74:19 view 8:14 15:6 19:11 21:23 36:12 76:18 violate 11:13 12:20 violated 13:5 28:20 violating 12:1 13:3 16:13,15</p>	<p>16:17 violence 39:11 39:18 90:3 virtually 32:17 visibility-imp... 21:19 36:11 visit 45:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait 62:23 want 6:13 42:15 49:24 50:2 57:21 58:13 59:12 63:9 72:11,16,16 78:10 80:18 81:9 84:11 85:1,3 wanted 11:2 43:24 wants 43:20 60:11,12 65:3 warming 23:20 24:24 27:13 Washington 2:23 3:5,10 wasn't 38:9 70:18 87:6 way 9:13 11:8 20:1 21:2 24:19 25:10 31:8 35:8 42:15 44:13 46:10 50:23 57:5,9 60:17 62:9 63:22 66:1 69:19 71:5 75:17 76:13 80:4 82:6 83:21 90:6,12 ways 12:1 56:3 81:24 wayside 31:5 we're 11:22 12:19 17:2,3 19:9 31:7</p>	<p>34:19 37:25 43:16 51:4 54:8,8 55:5,25 70:23 71:24 75:23 79:17,18 79:19 84:19,19 84:19 86:15 we've 31:17 32:19 38:24 45:8 61:17,18 61:20 66:23 86:16 welfare 45:24 went 20:9 90:16 weren't 22:7 what-not 52:18 wider 83:8 Williamson 34:2 44:15 80:16 90:13,13 willing 41:12 win 58:11 window 66:10 windows 66:12 66:16 withheld 35:5 withhold 42:1 wondered 87:9 wonderful 43:7 word 18:6 19:21 20:21 21:1 25:8,8 36:14 38:5 44:17 90:11,20 words 5:17 7:15 21:3 29:11,12 42:14 52:5 57:16,19 64:19 84:17,20 87:20 work 18:1 28:5 34:18 44:8,12 44:13 52:1 55:25 58:18 60:3 62:9 71:12 83:21 worked 42:14 82:24</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>WORKING 1:18 worrying 69:14 worse 12:1 62:21 69:14,21 82:21 83:25 84:1 worth 88:17 wouldn't 7:15 9:19 37:10 42:24 66:13 68:6,15 71:4 79:10,15 write 59:1,1,2,3 80:19 writing 65:1 written 15:7 64:19 69:18 71:3 wrong 22:25 37:22 43:10 46:24 59:4,19 wrongly 6:1 wrote 11:2 60:5</p>	<p>75:5,5,6,8 80:6 80:7 yield 45:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>10 56:25 60:14 10:05 3:3 5:2 100 16:16 17:9 23:4 34:7,18 41:13,23 60:2 60:13 63:8 64:5 84:19 85:18 89:23 100,000 29:14 77:20 89:24 11 22:19 11:42 91:4 111 22:15 26:11 12-1146 1:4 5:4 12-1248 1:11 12-1254 1:20 12-1268 2:3 12-1269 2:10 12-1272 2:18 13A 13:12 140 50:15 144 89:6 15 56:25 68:4 180 9:9 1970 49:8 1977 49:7,9,9 59:8 1980 32:11,13 1988 73:14 74:11 1990 74:15,15 74:25</p>	<p>24 2:24 56:17 24/7 60:22 250 14:15 15:2,4 15:5,8,9,13,14 16:16 17:9 32:22 34:7,18 38:20 41:24 56:14 60:2,14 60:20,25 61:20 63:8 64:5,12 65:14 77:19 84:25 85:2 86:3 89:23 250-ton 23:4 250-tons-per-... 84:13 27A 18:16 29A 18:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>3 47:9,9,9 48:7 52:15 53:11 71:21,24 78:3 78:3,22 30 17:18 32:8,20 36:22 33 4:7 34-year 53:19 54:2,7 34-year-long 53:24 34A 47:22 35 50:19 365-day-a-year 60:22 39 50:19</p>	<p>56:20 88:3 50 64:21 84:20 500 38:23 39:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <hr/> <p>6.1 56:20 86:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <hr/> <p>7061(a)(a) 41:1 7411 23:23 25:17 46:22,25 47:1,15,19,24 48:3 49:12,13 49:21,23 58:8 58:12,19,19 59:11,14,21,22 73:7 78:5 7411(a) 24:1 7411(a)(4) 35:22 7411(b) 25:5 7411(e) 26:23 7471 13:11,16 25:18 27:4 7475 23:9 38:17 7475(3) 77:23 7475(3)(c) 77:24 7475(a)(3) 47:5 7475(a)(4) 77:8 7475(e) 18:15 25:21 7479 38:10 7479(1) 53:21 7491 36:9 7574(a)(4) 72:23 7661(a)(A) 35:1</p>	<hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <hr/> <p>90 23:17 24:24 25:22 27:10,14 88:25 90-plus 22:21 24:20</p>
<hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/> <p>x 1:2,7,8,15,16 1:24,25 2:7,8 2:14,15,22 60:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>Y 60:7 yeah 42:19 77:18 86:6 year 15:14 17:9 23:5 29:15 32:22 38:20 41:14,24 48:15 56:15 60:20,25 61:20,21 62:22 64:12 65:14 77:19,20 83:24 85:3 86:3 89:23 years 17:18 32:8 32:8,21 36:22</p>	<hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2 33:15 35:18 75:5,5,6,8 2014 2:24 21A 47:5</p>	<hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <hr/> <p>400 70:24 41,000 56:19,24 44 41:1 45 4:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <hr/> <p>5 4:4 28:8 30:1 33:17 34:1 35:3,8 36:5</p>	<hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <hr/> <p>8-year 49:2,3 80 73:2 83 9:8 52:8 58:9 58:11 78:21 8386 73:3 85 86:15 86 9:7 52:11 58:9,11 78:21 88 4:13</p>	