ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, et al.)
Petitioners,)
v. UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, and REGINA A. McCARTHY, Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency)) Case No. 15-1363)))
Respondents.))
ALABAMA POWER COMPNAY, GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, GULF POWER COMPANY, and MISSISSIPPI POWER COMPANY	-
Petitioners,) 15-1363 and other) consolidated cases)
v.)
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY and GINA McCARTHY, Administrator,)))
Respondents.)

Filed: 12/18/2015

PETITIONERS ALABAMA POWER COMPANY, GEORGIA POWER COMPANY, GULF POWER COMPANY AND MISSISSIPPI POWER COMPANY'S NONBINDING STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE RAISED

Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, and Mississippi Power Company (collectively, "Petitioners") submit this preliminary and nonbinding statement of issues to be raised in this proceeding challenging the final action of the Respondent United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") entitled *Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Electric Generating Units*, 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015) ("Final Rule").

Whether EPA's Final Rule is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law as a result of:

- 1. EPA's failure to satisfy its duty to make an endangerment finding as required under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act;
- 2. EPA's regulation of existing fossil fuel-fired electric generating units under Clean Air Act Section 111(d) when those sources are already regulated under Section 112;
- 3. EPA's inclusion of "outside-the-fence" measures, which are not achievable at the affected sources, as part of the "best system of emission reduction";

4. EPA's interpretation of the Clean Air Act's definition of "stationary

source" to include "owners or operators" of a source;

- 5. EPA's interpretation of the Clean Air Act's definition of "system of emission reduction" to include "any set of things" over which the owner or operator has control;
- 6. EPA's failure to evaluate the achievability of its "Building Blocks" collectively, rather than the achievability of each "Building Block" standing alone;
- 7. EPA's failure to identify standards that an individual source can achieve through measures taken at the source;
- 8. EPA's failure to demonstrate that the assumed heat rate improvements are achievable, taking into account factors that alter heat rate and the unsustainable nature of heat rate improvements;
- 9. EPA's determination of a source's gas-shifting capabilities with insufficient state, region, or national-level data to support its conclusion;
- 10. EPA's incorrect treatment of a reduction in generation or ceased operations at an affected source as the "best system of emission reduction" in identify guidelines for a "standard of performance";

- 11. EPA's application of the "best system of emission reduction" to displace coal-fueled electric generating units in favor of natural gas combined cycle units and renewable generation;
- 12. EPA's unfounded reliance on interstate trading between affected sources and non-emitting sources as part of the "best system of emission reduction";
- 13. EPA's infringement on the states' authority to establish "standards of performance" under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act;
- 14. EPA's failure to adequately consider costs, as required under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act, when developing guidelines for "standards of performance";
- 15. EPA's identification of standards for existing sources under Section 111(d) that are more stringent than standards it has established for new sources under Section 111(b);
- 16. EPA's failure to provide an adequate opportunity for States to take into consideration the "remaining useful life" of affected sources and "other factors" when developing State plans;
- 17. EPA's failure to adequately address reliability concerns;
- 18. EPA's regulation of new sources within its rule covering existing sources; and

19. EPA's unprecedented overreach into areas of the States' and other agencies' authority in an effort to regulate the entire electricity system.

Additionally, whether EPA's Final Rule is unconstitutional as a result of:

20. EPA's commandeering of state authority in violation of the 10th Amendment.

Date: December 18, 2015 Respectfully submitted,

MARGARET CLAIBORNE CAMPBELL ANGELA J. LEVIN Troutman Sanders LLP 600 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 5200 Atlanta, GA 30308-2216 Tel: (404) 885-3000 margaret.campbell@troutmandsanders.com angela.levin@troutmansanders.com

FOR GEORGIA POWER COMPANY

TERESE T. WYLY
BEN H. STONE
Balch & Bingham LLP
1310 Twenty Fifth Avenue
Gulfport, MS 39501-1931
Tel: (228) 214-0413
twyly@balch.com
bstone@balch.com

FOR MISSISSIPPI POWER COMPANY

/<u>s/ C. Grady Moore III</u>

Filed: 12/18/2015

C. GRADY MOORE, III STEVEN G. MCKINNEY Balch & Bingham LLP 1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500 Birmingham, AL 35203-4642 Tel: (205) 251-8100

Fax: (205) 251-8100 Fax: (205) 488-5704 gmoore@balch.com smckinney@balch.com

FOR ALABAMA POWER COMPANY

Filed: 12/18/2015

JEFFREY A. STONE Beggs & Lane, RLLP 501 Commendencia Street Pensacola, FL 32502 Tel: (850) 432-2451 JAS@beggslane.com

ROBERT A. MANNING GARY V. PERKO Hopping Green & Sams, P.A. 119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 300 Tallahassee, FL 32301 Tel: (850) 222-7500 robertm@hgslaw.com garyp@hgslaw.com

FOR GULF POWER COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing was served, this <u>18</u>th day of December, 2015, on all registered counsel through the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ C. Grady Moore III

Filed: 12/18/2015

C. GRADY MOORE III Balch & Bingham LLP 1901 Sixth Avenue North Suite 1500 Birmingham, AL 35303-4642 Tel: (205) 251-8100

Fax: (205) 226-8799 gmoore@balch.com