



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS

M. JODI RELL
Governor

June 7, 2007

The Honorable Rick Boucher
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality
Committee on Energy and Commerce
2125 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Dennis Hastert
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality
Committee on Energy and Commerce
2322A Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Boucher and Ranking Member Hastert,

On behalf of the State of Connecticut, I am writing to express my strong opposition to certain provisions of the June 1, 2007, Discussion Draft – *Alternative Fuels, Infrastructure and Vehicles*. These sections are unacceptable and would preempt efforts made by progressive states to combat climate change by crafting regulations that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Specifically, the bill would preempt California's passenger vehicles and light duty truck emission standards that will reduce greenhouse emissions by 30 percent. This threat is not solely a California problem as Connecticut and at least ten other states – collectively representing one-third of the U.S. automobile market – have adopted the California standards. Perhaps equally troubling is the bill's reversal of the recent Supreme Court decision identifying CO₂ as a pollutant within the scope of the Clean Air Act (*Massachusetts v. EPA*) and its delegation of sole authority to regulate an environmental program – vehicle greenhouse gas emissions – to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

The discussion draft would also establish new Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards for passenger and non-passenger vehicles: 36 mpg for passenger vehicles by 2021 and 30 mpg for non-passenger vehicles by 2024. These values are much lower than what will be technologically feasible as early as 5 to 10 years before these deadlines. Furthermore, the bill sets in place a process for determining interim standards that requires the NHTSA Administrator to set standards only 18 months before the model year in which they take place which is too late to influence the design of the vehicles. Thus no technology forcing will occur, nor will any clear signals be sent to suppliers to commercialize low greenhouse

gas technologies. The bill amounts to the status quo until after 2020, assuring little or no reduction in fuel use or CO2 emissions for more than a decade.

Though federal action on climate change is necessary, denying states the right to foster innovative solutions in the complete absence of meaningful federal action is not an acceptable solution. Many states such as Connecticut are at the forefront in the effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce dependency on carbon-based fuels for good reason. The threat of climate change is real and will impact our public health and welfare. Therefore, Congress should not only preserve the states' authority to initiate aggressive action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions now, but quite frankly, Congress should be taking action to partner with the states as the Clean Air Act intended and build upon our large volume of accomplishments. It is clear that much stronger action will be needed going forward to address the continuing threat of climate change. As I said in my recent op-ed with California Governor Schwarzenegger published in the *Washington Post*, the federal government needs to either become our partner or get out of the way.

I urge you to rethink the approach offered in the discussion draft, and to pursue policies that enhance and complement the efforts currently underway in the states.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Jodi Rell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

M. JODI RELL
Governor

cc: The Honorable John D. Dingell, Chairman, House Committee on Energy and
Commerce
The Honorable Joe Barton, Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy and
Commerce
Connecticut Congressional Delegation