

Knowing of your interest in Energy and Environmental policy I wanted to inform you of the Environmental Protection Agency's [finding](#) last week that greenhouse gases pose a threat to public health and welfare. This finding sets the stage for six greenhouse gases (GHGs), carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, to be broadly regulated by the EPA under the Clean Air Act (CAA).

In the 1970s we were concerned with "global cooling" and were warned of an impending ice age. Thirty years later I do not believe that the science regarding climate change is so substantiated as to warrant the EPA's proposed regulation of GHGs - including carbon dioxide, which every human being emits with every breath - in order to address climate change. Imposing CAA limits on nearly every emission source in our economy - from power plants to manufacturers to automobiles – would have a limited impact on air quality while inflicting extraordinary compliance costs that would be passed onto consumers and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs. Importantly, the majority of Americans believe we should not sacrifice economic growth for questionable environmental benefits.

While we should take practical measures to reduce GHG emissions, I strongly believe that giving businesses and consumers incentives to develop and implement alternative and advanced energy technology will lead to significant reductions in emissions sooner and at less cost than government regulation. Instead of expanding our unyielding environmental regulatory scheme, we should be streamlining it to allow for expedited development of clean, renewable energy sources such as nuclear, wind, hydroelectric and solar power. As the EPA continues with its comment period and proposed rulemaking on this issue, I urge President Obama's Administration and the EPA to listen to the American people and address GHG emissions in a way that won't cause tremendous economic harm and job losses.

[Share your thoughts](#)