

SEPTEMBER 2022

VOL. 22-8

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



LexisNexis

EDITOR'S NOTE: CLIMATE DISCLOSURE RULES

Victoria Prussen Spears

PROPOSED CLIMATE DISCLOSURE RULES FOR PUBLIC COMPANIES

Elizabeth A. Diffley, Walé Y. Oriola, Amy C. Seidel, Hamilton S. Carpenter and Katharine T. Thayer

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION ANNOUNCES MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ENFORCEMENT INITIATIVES

Raya B. Treiser, Emily Tabak, Jonathan E. Kidwell, Paul Barker, Alex Noll and Julia Waterhous

WEST VIRGINIA V. EPA: THE MAJOR QUESTIONS DOCTRINE ARRIVES TO REIN IN ADMINISTRATIVE POWER

Allison A. Torrence and Tatjana Vujic

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROPOSES PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NEW BUILDING ENERGY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Amy O'Brien and Amy L. Edwards

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FUNDING FOR STATE ORPHANED WELL PROGRAMS

Harve Truskett, Jason A. Hill, Garrett Korbitz and Sami M. Khan

THE EU TAKES FIRST STEPS TOWARD DEFINING GREEN HYDROGEN

Ellen S. Friedman and Ben Reiter

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 22

NUMBER 8

September 2022

Editor's Note: Climate Disclosure Rules Victoria Prussen Spears	263
Proposed Climate Disclosure Rules for Public Companies Elizabeth A. Diffley, Walé Y. Oriola, Amy C. Seidel, Hamilton S. Carpenter and Katharine T. Thayer	265
Biden Administration Announces Major Environmental Justice Enforcement Initiatives Raya B. Treiser, Emily Tabak, Jonathan E. Kidwell, Paul Barker, Alex Noll and Julia Waterhous	279
<i>West Virginia v. EPA</i>: The Major Questions Doctrine Arrives to Rein in Administrative Power Allison A. Torrence and Tatjana Vujic	284
District of Columbia Proposes Penalties for Failure to Comply with New Building Energy Performance Standards Amy O'Brien and Amy L. Edwards	289
Department of the Interior Funding for State Orphaned Well Programs Harve Truskett, Jason A. Hill, Garrett Korbitz and Sami M. Khan	293
The EU Takes First Steps Toward Defining Green Hydrogen Ellen S. Friedman and Ben Reiter	298

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please email:

Jessica Carnevale, Esq. at (212) 229-4942
Email: jessica.carnevale@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)
ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)
ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)
ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT’S ENERGY
LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Energy Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

West Virginia v. EPA: The Major Questions Doctrine Arrives to Rein in Administrative Power

*By Allison A. Torrence and Tatjana Vujic**

The authors discuss the implications of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision addressing the authority of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to regulate greenhouse gases under the federal Clean Air Act.

On the final day of its 2022 term, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its highly-anticipated opinion in the case of *West Virginia v. EPA*,¹ addressing the authority of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) to regulate greenhouse gases (“GHGs”) under the federal Clean Air Act (“CAA”), but having much broader implications for the authority of all administrative agencies.

The opinion signals a significant shift in the standards used to review administrative actions.

Chief Justice Roberts wrote the opinion for the Court, joined by Justices Thomas, Alito, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh and Barrett. Justice Gorsuch filed a concurring opinion, in which Justice Alito joined, and Justice Kagan filed a dissenting opinion, in which Justices Breyer and Sotomayor joined.

MAJOR QUESTIONS DOCTRINE HAS ITS DAY IN THE SUN

In a significant yet long-predicted move, the six-to-three opinion rejected the EPA’s approach to regulating GHG emissions under the Obama Administration’s Clean Power Plan (“CPP”), under which the EPA intended to regulate existing coal- and natural-gas-fired power plants pursuant to Section 111(d) of the CAA.²

* Allison A. Torrence, a partner in the Chicago office of Jenner & Block LLP, is a member of the firm’s Environmental and Workplace Health & Safety Law Practice as well as the firm’s Climate and Clean Technology Law Practice. She has significant experience in environmental litigation, working on cases involving toxic torts, CERCLA, RCRA, the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act, among other matters. Tatjana Vujic works as special counsel in the firm’s Energy Group in Washington, D.C., where she focuses on issues related to climate and the energy transition. The authors may be contacted at atorrence@jenner.com and tvujic@jenner.com, respectively.

¹ *West Virginia v. EPA*, 579 U.S. ____ (2022); https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-1530_n758.pdf.

² Notably, the CPP was revoked by the Trump EPA, and the Biden EPA has stated that it intends to promulgate new GHG regulations different from the previous rules under past

Of greater significance, however, the Court took the opportunity to fully embrace the “major questions doctrine,” a standard several Justices had endorsed but which had not yet been fully unveiled by the Court. The doctrine now requires agencies, in instances in which a regulation will have major economic and political consequences, to point to clear statutory language showing congressional authorization for the power claimed by the agency.

In particular, in “extraordinary cases” in which “the history and the breadth of the authority that the agency has asserted and the economic and political significance of that assertion” is significant or major, courts have “a reason to hesitate before concluding that Congress meant to confer such authority.”

In such extraordinary cases, the Court will not read into ambiguous statutory text authority that is not clearly spelled out. Instead, “something more than a merely plausible textual basis for the agency action is necessary”; specifically, “[t]he agency instead must point to clear congressional authorization for the power it claims.”

As support for the adoption and application of the major questions doctrine, the Court cited numerous cases in which agency authority was curtailed because of extraordinary circumstances that it determined required a clear congressional directive. The cases included:

- The FDA’s attempt to regulate tobacco;³
- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s effort to issue an eviction moratorium during the COVID-19 pandemic;⁴
- The EPA’s assertion of permitting authority over millions of small sources like hotels and office buildings;⁵ and
- The Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s endeavor to require 84 million Americans either obtain a COVID-19 vaccine or undergo weekly testing.⁶

All of these, according to the Court, involved an agency overstepping its authority to act in situations not dissimilar from the extraordinary circumstances presented in *West Virginia v. EPA*.

administrations. Nevertheless, the Court held that the parties had standing to proceed and the case was not moot.

³ *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120 (2000).

⁴ *Alabama Assn. of Realtors v. Dept. of Health & Human Servs.*, 594 U.S. ____ (2021).

⁵ *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 573 U.S. 302 (2014).

⁶ *National Federation of Independent Business v. OSHA*, 595 U.S. ____ (2021).

The dissent, on the other hand, regarded the majority's use of the major questions doctrine to be without precedent, observing that "[t]he Court has never even used the term 'major questions doctrine' before."

As discussed below, when the Court determines that the major questions doctrine applies, even if the administrative action arguably fits within what may seem like a broad grant of statutory authority, it is not necessarily enough to authorize the agency to act. Rather, if the court finds that the administrative rule is an "extraordinary case," i.e., will have a significant economic or political impact, the agency must base its action on very clear congressional authorization to justify the power it is attempting to assert.

CLEAN POWER PLAN IS OUT BUT REGULATING GHGS STILL OK

Turning back to the regulation at issue in *West Virginia*, the Court reviewed the Clean Power Plan, which dates back to the Obama Administration's EPA. At that time, the EPA promulgated the CPP pursuant to its authority under the New Source Performance Standards ("NSPS") in Section 111(d) of the CAA. The Court's review thus centered on Section 111(d), which gives the EPA authority to select the "best system of emission reduction" for existing sources of pollution, like power plants.⁷

Under the CPP, the Obama Administration's EPA used the NSPS to set GHG emission standards for existing power plants which would require many operators to shut down older coal-fired units and/or shift generation to lower-emitting natural gas units or renewable sources of electricity. The Court viewed the EPA's CPP, which would have required power producers to significantly change the generation mix, as an "extraordinary case" because it would have a major impact on the economy and was a "transformative expansion in [the EPA's] regulatory authority" based on "vague language" in the CAA.

In addition, the Court noted that the EPA was using an "ancillary provision" in the CAA to regulate GHGs and stated that "the Agency's discovery [of Section 111(d)]"—which the Court described as a "gap filler"—"allowed it to adopt a regulatory program that Congress had conspicuously and repeatedly declined to enact itself."

BEST SYSTEM OF EMISSION REDUCTION

Notably, the Court acknowledged that "as a matter of definitional possibilities, generation shifting can be described as a system" (and thus a "best system of emission reduction"), but nevertheless determined that the CAA's grant of

⁷ 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d).

authority was too vague. According to the Court, almost anything could be described as a “system,” and therefore the CPP was based on a vague grant of authority and did not pass the major questions doctrine test. The majority found such a broad grant of authority questionable, particularly because climate change legislation has been debated in Congress for years with no action, signaling that the EPA could not exercise such broad authority when Congress had clearly declined to take such action itself.

By contrast and contrary to the majority’s narrow reading of “best system of emission reduction,” the dissent argued that the generation shifting prescribed by the CPP was precisely the type of “system” of emission reduction permitted under the CAA.

In particular, the dissent contended that the term “system” is not vague (which Justice Kagan defined as unclear, ambiguous or hazy) but intentionally expansive to allow for such system-wide programs. Thus, the crux of the disagreement between the majority and dissent is that the dissent saw the CAA as having bestowed broad authority on the EPA to regulate complex and important issues of air pollution—including and especially climate change, particularly considering the severity of the problem—in the manner that the EPA determines is most appropriate, while the majority required further scrutiny for large-scale administrative endeavors like the CPP, which it held require very clear and specific authorization.

WHAT’S NEXT?

In terms of the implications of *West Virginia*, what is clear is that the major questions doctrine is here to stay and the EPA’s ability to regulate GHG’s under Section 111(d) of the CAA may be curtailed but has not been rejected. In fact, the Court specifically endorsed the EPA’s authority to regulate GHGs. So, what does this mean, not only for GHG regulation but also for agency rulemaking in general?

First, while the ruling marks a significant setback for the EPA, it does not shut the door on the agency’s ability to regulate GHGs. The CPP rules at issue raised the specter of the major questions doctrine because the regulation would have required generation shifting across the entire energy industry—an action viewed by the Court as having a significant impact on the national economy.

The Court, however, declined to opine on “how far our opinion constrains EPA,” indicating that the EPA’s authority had not been disallowed. In fact, the opinion unequivocally states that it is within the EPA’s purview to set a specific limit on GHG emissions:

Although the States set the actual rules governing existing power plants, EPA itself still retains the primary regulatory role in Section

111(d). The Agency, not the States, decides the amount of pollution reduction that must ultimately be achieved.

Nothing in the opinion suggests that the EPA cannot choose to regulate GHGs at power plants with more traditional technology-based requirements. Indeed, an inside-the-fence-line regulation that requires technology like carbon-capture would likely be within the EPA's traditional expertise and less likely to implicate large swaths of the economy like generation switching, and hence not be struck down.

Looking beyond the EPA and GHG regulation, additional fallout from the Court's embrace of the major questions doctrine is sure to occur. In addition to the Court's explicit adoption of the major questions doctrine, Justice Gorsuch—a longstanding proponent of the doctrine—used his concurring opinion to lay out what he saw as the appropriate elements to consider when evaluating administrative rules under the doctrine. While Justice Gorsuch's concurrence is not binding, future courts and administrative agencies likely will look to both the Court's majority opinion and the Gorsuch concurrence for guidance. Administrative regulations will face increased challenges and heightened judicial scrutiny thanks to the major questions doctrine, and we can expect to see not only the number of challenges increase but also the number of successful challenges rise.

Additionally, administrative agencies may proactively rein in regulatory actions they were planning to promulgate—keeping the rules more modest or tailored in an attempt to avoid challenges based on the major questions doctrine.

Undoubtedly, this will not be the last word on the EPA's regulation of GHGs or the use of the major questions doctrine. The EPA will issue new GHG regulations, which certainly will invite future litigation. The decision will also certainly trigger many more challenges of agency authority under the newly minted major questions doctrine.