

**Road to Paris: Examining the President's International Climate Agenda and Implications  
for Domestic Environmental Policy  
Wednesday, July 8, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.**

There has been a lot of coverage regarding the UN's climate conference at the end of this year. We've heard how the President has pledged the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28% compared to the 2005 level by 2025 and how he is going to lead other countries in "openness, transparency and accountability."

All of these statements sound good in a press release, but the slightest level of scrutiny reveals a significant lack in authenticity, substance and merit. And while the President is lecturing the rest of the world on the importance of credibility and transparency, he is going out of his way to write the U.S. Senate and the American people out of a final agreement. That is why we are here today – to take a closer look at the President's international climate agenda and what it actually means for the U.S.

The President may have creative legal arguments to sign on to a "legally nonbinding" international agreement, but he does not have the backing of the U.S. Senate, which significantly limits such an agreement's domestic application. I carried that same message in 2009 when I attended the UN's COP-15 in Copenhagen, and it remains true.

The President's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) is not only unrealistic, but also does not add up. [*Refer to Mind the Gap Chart*]. According to a recent analysis by the U.S. Chamber, the President's INDC is about 33% short of meeting the stated targets. Mr. Bookbinder, who has done his own analysis, has found an even greater gap, and I am looking forward to his thorough breakdown. Additional studies are forthcoming showing similar results.

The Administration has yet to describe how the 26-28% of greenhouse gas reductions would be achieved. In fact, the Administration's own Deputy Director for Climate Policy remains unable and unwilling to answer this basic question.

Further concerning is that a large portion of the INDC's stated targets depend upon the successful implementation of the President's so-called Clean Power Plan. This proposal not only faces significant obstacles at the state level – 32 states oppose the \$479 billion federal takeover that would increase the price of electricity, depress local economies and ship American jobs overseas – but is also on legally treacherous ground especially in the wake of two recent Supreme Court decisions – *UARG v. EPA* and *Michigan v. EPA* decided just last week. The remaining portions of the INDC rely on an

exaggerated stretch of current and future regulatory actions without consideration for inevitable legal challenges and delays.

Even the very notion that the President's domestic and international climate agendas are about protecting the environment lack credibility. His EPA did not even bother to assess the miniscule environmental benefits associated with the Clean Power Plan – his supposed core domestic climate policy—and the international climate negotiators have already admitted that while they aren't entirely clear on what actions will be needed to limit temperature increases to 2 degrees Celsius, they are sure that the Paris agreement will not be enough.

I thank the witnesses for being here and look forward to their testimony.