Message

From: van Hoogstraten, David Jan [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/0

Sent: 16/02/2016 20:06:14

To: Stout, Robert [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/C Jefferiss, Paul H. [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE

ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS

Subject: FW: RFF on the Issues: Supreme Court blocks Clean Power Plan; Obama's oil fee; and more

Redacted - First Amendment

David J. van Hoogstraten

Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs (Environmental)

BP America Inc.

Washington, DC 20005

Direct: Mobile:

From: Resources for the Future

@mail98.suw13.rsgsv.net] On Behalf Of Resources for the

Future

Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 3:00 PM

To: van Hoogstraten, David Jan

Subject: RFF on the Issues: Supreme Court blocks Clean Power Plan; Obama's oil fee; and more



RFF on the Issues

February 16, 2016

In this issue:

- Commentary on the Supreme Court's stay of EPA's Clean Power Plan
- RFF experts weigh in on the merits and economic impacts of a carbon tax
- Assessing President Obama's proposed fee on oil companies

EPA's Clean Power Plan Blocked by Supreme Court

Last week, the US Supreme Court granted a stay blocking the Environmental Protection Agency from requiring states to submit plans for major reductions in carbon emissions from electric power plants. The

stay marks a setback for President Obama's Clean Power Plan, which aims to reduce carbon pollution from the power sector by 30 percent from 2005 levels.

The 5-4 vote was unusual, as the Supreme Court rarely grants a request to halt a regulation before review by a lower court. Nathan Richardson, a visiting fellow at RFF, notes "the bigger signal here is that there's a lot of skepticism from the Supreme Court. You're getting an earlier view of how the justices feel." RFF's Dallas Burtraw and Josh Linn also weighed in on RFF's blog (here and here).

Beyond the Clean Power Plan, Considering a Carbon Tax

The US Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan suffered a setback this week as the Supreme Court blocked the agency from requiring states to submit compliance plans until the program is reviewed by a lower court. Beyond the Clean Power Plan, and given polarized opinions on various regulatory approaches to tackling climate change, some argue that carbon emissions reductions <u>would be better addressed by a carbon tax</u>.

RFF experts discuss the issue:

- Marc Hafstead and Roberton C. Williams III find that a carbon tax is <u>unlikely to reduce the number of jobs in the US economy</u>. Instead, jobs will shift away from polluting industries toward cleaner ones, a transition that can be made smoother by sound policy design.
- Similarly, <u>Chad stone notes</u> that a climate rebate delivered through existing tax and benefit systems could "fully offset the impact of a carbon tax on the purchasing power of low- and moderate-income households."
- <u>Gilbert Metcalf discusses</u> how including a carbon tax in overall tax reform could "contribute to the overall efficiency of the tax system."

Obama's Tax on Oil

President Obama recently <u>released a plan</u> to make "smart and strategic investments to create a cleaner, more sustainable transportation system." These investments would be paid for by a fee (or tax) on oil companies, which would also "reduce carbon pollution, cut oil consumption, and create new jobs." While economists at RFF see advantages to such a plan, they note that it would be more efficient for the "tax base to be broadbased—that is, on oil, natural gas, and coal."

RFF experts weigh in:

- A \$10 per barrel tax moves to align the price of oil with its social costs; still, "the proposed tax does not reflect research on the full environmental costs of oil use," writes RFF's Stephen P.A. Brown in a <u>new</u> blog post.
- RFF's Alan Krupnick <u>explains in the Washington Post</u> that the tax might be more "politically palatable" if it was used "not for new spending but to reduce other taxes."
- "It also makes sense to start implementing it now, while oil prices are low, before consumers get too used to them again and stop wanting fuel-efficient vehicles," says RFF's Carolyn Fischer on Climate Central.
- "This tax will reduce oil consumption, but not by a lot. . . . A broad-based carbon tax, even at a fairly low rate, would do much more to reduce emissions," says RFF's Rob Williams on <u>Climate Central</u>.

STAY CONNECTED

The bibble image perceive deplayed. The first may have more more, the perceive of the perceive days for perceive to the second first of beauty.	The bladd image control for deplaned. The for many been laster made, many set, or indicate freely name the respective to the control. (Se and bradies.)	To bear improvements deplets. To the new hore her money, the term of the state of t	[7] The billed began contains a depleted. The filter services bear record, or shadow, but the first the printers for corner file and builder.

 $\underline{\text{Update your subscription preferences.}} \; \big| \; \underline{\text{Unsubscribe from all RFF emails.}} \; \big| \; \underline{\text{Privacy Policy}}$

© Resources for the Future Washington, DC 20036 | www.rff.org