November 3, 2025

The Honorable Lee Zeldin
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

**Re: Reconsideration of the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, 90 Fed. Reg. 44,591 (Sept. 16, 2025) [Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0186]**

Dear Administrator Zeldin:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") proposed rule, "Reconsideration of the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program," 90 Fed. Reg. 44,591 (Sept. 16, 2025) (the "Proposal" or "Proposed Rule").

The undersigned organizations (hereafter the "Coalition") represent a diverse set of industries that report their greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions under EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program ("GHGRP"). We recognize the benefits of a standardized Federal reporting program in supporting economic competitiveness, growing exports, and reducing the potential for multiple different standards at the state level. By investing in advanced technologies and sustainable practices, these industries not only continue to enhance their operational efficiency but also contribute to improving environmental performance. From supporting local supply chains to reducing emissions and adopting more resilient solutions, businesses at the local level are continually innovating to strengthen their economies while ensuring a healthier, more sustainable future.

The GHGRP serves important market, regulatory, and competitiveness functions for American business, and has become an important tool for businesses seeking to satisfy various regulatory obligations, demonstrate equivalency with international trade policies, support emerging domestic industries, and provide a source of credible data, among other vital uses. The Coalition supports the continuation of the GHGRP for the reasons discussed below. As an alternative to ending the program, the Coalition would recommend that EPA allow the GHGRP to continue with targeted modifications made through the reconsideration process. This kind of balanced approach to the GHGRP would reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens while preserving the value of standardized GHG data. Maintaining some form of reliable national reporting framework like the GHGRP will discourage a patchwork of state and local regulations, support American industry, and assist companies participating in the global economy.

## A. We Support the Administration's Commitment to Reducing Regulatory Burdens

While some level of government regulation is essential to safeguard public safety, protect the environment, and promote competitive and free markets, excessive or poorly designed regulations can stifle innovation and limit the ability of businesses and markets to adapt and grow.[1] We support smart regulations that avoid micromanagement of businesses, support job creation in communities, and grow the economy.

We have concerns regarding the impact of overly burdensome regulations on the business sector, economic growth, and international competitiveness.[2] EPA's focus on right-sizing the federal regulatory obligations is critical to fostering a business environment that encourages the type of investment and growth that can propel the President's goals of "unleashing American energy" and achieving "energy dominance."[3]

While we recognize the importance of reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens, we believe that maintaining the GHGRP—with targeted improvements as referenced below—strikes a prudent balance. This approach preserves the value of standardized emissions data, helping to avoid a fragmented regulatory landscape while supporting American businesses in meeting regulatory obligations, demonstrating alignment with international trade policies, and enabling growth in emerging domestic industries.

## B. The GHGRP Provides Multiple Benefits to U.S. Industries

One of the GHGRP's most important benefits stems from its establishment of a standardized, government-sanctioned framework for calculating GHG emissions. Reporters must follow prescribed methodologies and self-certify the accuracy of their data prior to submission. EPA also supports data integrity through audits and quality assurance checks.

The GHGRP serves as a federal imprimatur of GHG emissions data which provides a wide range of practical functions—supporting markets, providing important information to investors and other financial stakeholders, facilitating international trade, and advancing domestic technologies and industries. Rescinding the GHGRP

---

[1] *See* Neil Bradley, "How Excessive Regulation Hurts the Economy" (Jan 16, 2025), available at https://www.uschamber.com/economy/how-excessive-regulation-hurts-the-economy.

[2] *See, e.g.*, Suzanne P. Clark, *Let the Trump Deregulation Begin*, Wall Street Journal (Nov. 11, 2024), available at https://www.wsj.com/opinion/let-the-trump-deregulation-begin-us-chamber-of-commerce-second-term-economic-growth-73f24387 .

[3] *See*, e.g., Executive Order 14154 (Jan. 20, 2025), available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/unleashing-american-energy/; Executive Order 14213 (Feb. 14, 2025), available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/02/establishing-the-national-energy-dominance-council/.

could disrupt these functions and create new challenges and costs for many U.S. businesses.

EPA should consider these lost benefits in any final regulatory impact analysis accompanying the final rule. That analysis should factor in sunk costs or stranded investments, such as monitoring equipment, upgraded data management systems, time spent training personnel, and efforts to develop internal protocols to track and report emissions. The agency should also evaluate any potential costs associated with lost or uncertain tax credit eligibility, reduced export competitiveness, and the loss of the other benefits catalogued below.

### 1. Reducing the Risk of a Costly Patchwork of State and Local Requirements

Eliminating the GHGRP at the federal level runs the risk of increasing rather than decreasing regulatory burdens on American businesses. While improvements to the GHGRP can continue to be made, the GHGRP currently serves as a unified federal program that reduces the likelihood of state and local governments' developing independent and unique reporting programs that would impose far greater compliance costs on industry. The GHGRP's standardizing effect enables companies to navigate reporting obligations efficiently while reducing administrative burden. This benefit stems not only from the structure of the GHGRP itself, but also from companies' having roughly 15 years of experience complying with the program, which makes it a more efficient regulatory regime than an onslaught of disparate state and local reporting rules.

There is concern that, in the absence of a consistent federal reporting framework, state and local governments would rush to develop their own reporting requirements, thereby increasing regulatory burden and decreasing U.S. business competitiveness. For businesses operating across multiple jurisdictions, the costs of complying with a multiplicity of state or local programs would likely be significantly higher than complying with the GHGRP.

The Administration has recognized this precise concern. The Department of Justice recently issued a Request for Information ("RFI") specifically seeking input on "State laws significantly and adversely affecting the national economy or interstate commerce."[4] As the RFI notes, President Trump recognized in E.O. 14260, "Protecting American Energy from State Overreach," that—

[4] *Request for Information on State Laws Having Significant Adverse Effects on the National Economy or Significant Adverse Effects on Interstate Commerce,* 90 Fed. Reg. 39,427 (Aug. 15, 2025).

> State-level practices can drive up nationwide costs and undermine American safety and "undermine Federalism by projecting the regulatory preferences of a few States into all States." Anecdotal evidence and the experience of countless Americans across the country strongly suggest that State laws and regulations can significantly burden commerce in other States and between States, thus raising costs unnecessarily and harming markets nationwide.[5]

A fragmented state-by-state GHG reporting landscape would exemplify exactly the type of problematic state practice that the Administration is working to rein in.

The risks of a state-by-state regulatory patchwork are already evident. Several states, including California, Oregon, and Washington, have developed independent GHG reporting programs, and New York is poised to implement its own requirements. Companies operating across multiple states face mounting challenges navigating the intricacies of these varying programs, including:

- Inconsistent reporting thresholds and methodologies;
- Differing compliance timelines;
- Duplicative verification requirements;
- Different IT system requirements;
- Differing calculation methodologies; and
- Separate legal and consulting costs for each jurisdiction.

Without the standardizing influence of the GHGRP, there is a very real risk of an acceleration of new state and local programs with jurisdictions rushing to fill a perceived GHG emissions data gap—potentially leading to a surge of fragmented and conflicting regulatory requirements. The existence of a single federal reporting program through the GHGRP currently helps constrain this regulatory expansion by making emissions data from facilities readily available to state and local authorities without imposing on industry the additional burden of a patchwork of regulatory requirements. Additionally, having a uniform federal program makes it possible for stakeholders, such as investors, to compare GHG emissions across companies and states—an apples-to-apples comparison that may not be available if jurisdictions begin to diverge in their GHG calculations and methodologies.

---

[5] *Id.* at 39,428 (quoting Executive Order 14260, "Protecting American Energy from State Overreach," 90 Fed. Reg. 15513 (Apr. 8, 2025)).

Some states have incorporated the GHGRP in lieu of developing their own set of state requirements. For example, under Colorado's GHG reporting program, most source categories are required to report their emissions "to the same extent as reported under 40 C.F.R. Part 98."[6] The Colorado program leverages federal GHGRP data and methodologies extensively, avoiding for many companies the need to develop independent systems that would impose additional costs on industry. Even where Colorado's program differs, the state realizes significant administrative efficiencies by frequently cross-referencing or incorporating by reference the federal GHGRP regulations.[7] This approach reduces both state administrative costs and industry regulatory reporting burdens—benefits that would be eliminated if the federal framework were rescinded.

In other cases, state agencies explicitly allow companies to substitute GHGRP data and protocols in place of more burdensome or duplicative requirements. For example, Texas regulations require operators registering for certification of geologic storage of carbon dioxide incidental to enhanced recovery of oil, gas, or geothermal resources to develop and submit a comprehensive monitoring, sampling, and testing plan to verify geologic storage of the carbon dioxide.[8] However, operators may avoid the complexity of developing a novel plan by complying with Subpart RR (Geologic Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide) or Subpart UU (Injection of Carbon Dioxide) and providing the state agency a copy of the information already being submitted to EPA.[9] This approach streamlines regulatory reporting, reduces administrative costs, and promotes consistency across regulatory frameworks.

EPA should uphold its standardizing role by maintaining and improving the GHGRP, thereby minimizing regulatory burdens that could result from a fragmented patchwork of state reporting requirements. Additionally, we would welcome the opportunity to work with the White House, the Department of Justice, EPA, and other departments and agencies—as well as Congress—to develop policies that limit myriad state and local regulatory burdens where similar federal authorities and programs exist.

### 2. Growing American Energy and Manufacturing Export Markets

The GHGRP's standardized, verified reporting framework empowers American companies with the credibility needed to expand American energy and manufacturing products in global markets that increasingly demand transparent GHG data. The GHGRP provides a consistent federal structure that lends credibility and comparability to company-reported data. The economic value of these export markets is substantial

[6] *See* 5 Colo. Code Regs. 1001-26, Pt. A, § III.A.6.
[7] *See, e.g.*, 5 Colo. Code Regs. 1001-26, Pt. A, § III.B.1–7 (requiring for several source categories the use of federal GHGRP methodologies for calculating GHG emissions).
[8] *See* 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 5.305.
[9] *Id.* § 5.305(3).

and is growing rapidly. For example, the United States is already the world's largest supplier of liquified natural gas ("LNG"), with the majority of its LNG exports going to European markets.[10] That thriving export market is part of an overall LNG industry that is projected to contribute $1.3 trillion in GDP benefits through 2040, while supporting 495,000 jobs nationwide—with 37 percent of those (183,000 jobs) in non-producing states.[11] These economic benefits extend across all 50 states, with 39 states supporting at least 1,000 LNG-related jobs, and some states realizing more than $2,000 in per capita economic benefits through 2040. These substantial benefits align with the Administration's energy dominance objectives, but they depend in part on American companies maintaining competitive access to international markets that increasingly require verified emissions data. Without an accredited and standardized reporting system, American businesses may struggle to compete in markets that require verified emissions information, such as:

- EU Methane Emissions Regulation: Starting in 2027, new contracts between EU importers and non-EU LNG suppliers must comply with stringent monitoring, reporting, and verification obligations.[12] The EU regulation allows for "national equivalence determinations" that would enable supplier countries to be considered compliant as a whole, rather than requiring the increased burden of company-by-company verification. Rescinding the GHGRP could undermine efforts to demonstrate U.S. equivalence with the requisite EU measures. Recent press reports indicate that the Administration is requesting changes in those policies, while at the same time working to secure significant new EU agreements to purchase U.S. oil and natural gas.[13]

- EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism ("CBAM"): Beginning in 2026, U.S. exporters of cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, and hydrogen will need to provide verified, product-level GHG emissions data to EU importers, who are responsible for registering the goods with national authorities and purchasing CBAM certificates.[14] Facility-level GHGRP data

---

[10] U.S. Energy Information Administration, *The United States remained the world's largest liquefied natural gas exporter in 2024*, Today in Energy (Mar. 27, 2025), available at https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=64844.

[11] *See* S&P Global, Major New US Industry at a Crossroads: A US LNG Impact Study – Phase 1 (Dec. 17, 2024), *available at* https://www.spglobal.com/en/research-insights/special-reports/major-new-us-industry-at-a-crossroads-us-lng-impact-study-phase-1; U.S. Chamber of Commerce, *"Economic and Environmental Benefits of U.S. LNG: Top Findings from S&P Global Phase 2 LNG Impact Study Supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce*," *available at* https://www.uschamber.com/assets/documents/S-and-P-Global-Phase-2-LNG-Impact-Study_-US-Chamber-March-2025-Factsheet.pdf.

[12] *See generally* Regulation (EU) 2024/1787 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on the reduction of methane emissions in the energy sector and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/942.

[13] Oliver Milman, *US Demands EU Reverse New Climate Rules to Allow Surge in Gas Imports*, The Guardian (Oct. 22, 2025), *available at* https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/oct/22/us-eu-climate-rules-lng-gas.

[14] *See generally* Regulation (EU) 2023/956 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 May 2023 establishing a carbon border adjustment mechanism.

would be a useful foundation for U.S. exporters seeking to demonstrate the carbon intensity of their products.

- EU Low Carbon Fuel Standards: Under the EU Low Carbon Fuels Delegated Act, biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen will be required to demonstrate at least a 70 percent reduction in GHG emissions compared to conventional fuels to qualify as "low-carbon."[15] This threshold is assessed using a full life-cycle methodology to calculate product-level emissions. For U.S. producers seeking access to the EU market, the GHGRP can serve as an important data source to qualify products as "low-carbon" in the EU.

- Emerging Asian Markets: Mandatory GHG reporting rules are being phased in across several Asian countries. China,[16] Japan,[17] South Korea,[18] and Thailand[19] are introducing regulations that require companies to disclose GHG emissions with some of those countries encouraging Scope 3 supply chain reporting. These developments will have significant implications for U.S. companies with operations, investments, or supplier relationships in Asia, as they may be required to provide detailed emissions data, such as what is collected under the GHGRP, to support compliance and maintain uninterrupted market access.

The GHGRP thus represents a strategic advantage for expanding American energy and manufacturing export markets. As noted above, some important markets are moving toward penalizing higher-GHG intensity imports, while others are now demanding increased GHG transparency. In both cases, by providing credible, standardized emissions data, the GHGRP enhances U.S. companies' ability to demonstrate compliance with international environmental requirements and negotiate from a position of strength in global markets. Eliminating this framework could weaken American competitiveness precisely when international demand for verified emissions

---

[15] *See generally* Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2025/192 of 9 September 2024 on procedures for the accreditation of verifiers pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2023/1805 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the use of renewable and low-carbon fuels in maritime transport, and amending Directive 2009/16/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.

[16] KPMG China, *China Stock Exchanges Finalised Mandatory Sustainability Reporting Requirements for Larger Listed Entities* (Apr. 12, 2024), https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/cn/pdf/en/2024/04/china-stock-exchanges-finalised-mandatory-sustainability-reporting-requirements-for-larger-listed-entities.pdf.

[17] Japan Compliance, *Japan's New Frontier in Corporate Reporting: Navigating Mandatory Sustainability Disclosures*, https://japancompliance.com/japans-new-frontier-in-corporate-reporting-navigating-mandatory-sustainability-disclosures/.

[18] ISS Corporate, *Mandatory Climate Disclosure in South Kore*a (May 31, 2024), https://www.iss-corporate.com/resources/blog/mandatory-climate-disclosure-in-south-korea/.

[19] Thailand Securities and Exchange Commission, *Public Hearing on the Roadmap for Sustainability Disclosure Standards* (Nov. 19, 2024), https://sec.or.th/Documents/PHS/Main/1030/hearing502567en.pdf.

data is accelerating, potentially jeopardizing the substantial economic benefits that these export industries deliver to American workers and communities nationwide.

### 3. Supporting Emerging Domestic Industries

Existing federal tax credit programs that support the growth of emerging domestic industries and American energy draw heavily from and in some cases rely on methodologies and data from the GHGRP. This information can serve as an important input for federal credit programs for carbon oxide sequestration under Section 45Q, for production of hydrogen under Section 45V, and for domestic production of low-carbon transportation fuels under Section 45Z—each of which benefits from accurate, facility-level emissions data to determine eligibility and to quantify incentives.

The GHGRP has historically provided a standardized, transparent, and verifiable emissions dataset that enables the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") and other agencies to administer these credits efficiently and with integrity.

The Section 45Q tax credit provides substantial economic incentives for enhanced oil recovery ("EOR") operations that utilize captured carbon dioxide and for carbon capture and sequestration ("CCS") operations for permanent geologic sequestration. Under current law, operators can claim credits when carbon dioxide is injected for EOR or stored in secure geological formations, with secure geologic storage demonstrated either by reporting to EPA under GHGRP Subpart RR, or by complying with the CSA/ANSI ISO 27916:19 standard now incorporated by reference into GHGRP Subpart VV. Section 45Q is expanding EOR operations that may increase oil and gas recovery rates compared to conventional extraction methods, effectively extending the productive life of existing oil fields and potentially unlocking billions of barrels of otherwise stranded domestic oil reserves. Additionally, CCS operations spurred by 45Q create jobs and unique opportunities for energy providers to meet emergent demand for lower carbon power from new natural gas generators, amongst other uses. Accordingly, EOR and CCS align directly with President Trump's Executive Order on "Unleashing American Energy," which establishes a national policy "to encourage energy exploration and production" and "solidify the United States as a global energy leader long into the future,"[20] while the standardized GHGRP methodologies provide or harmonize with verification frameworks that enables energy producers to confidently advance these Presidential objectives.

For American businesses, this means greater certainty and reduced administrative burden. Because the GHGRP already requires detailed emissions reporting from thousands of facilities across the country, companies have been able to

[20] Executive Order 14154 § 2(a) (Jan. 20, 2025), available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/unleashing-american-energy/.

leverage existing infrastructure to qualify for tax incentives—avoiding duplicative reporting requirements that would otherwise increase costs and delay investment. This alignment between environmental reporting and tax policy helps streamline project development timelines, particularly for capital-intensive sectors like energy and manufacturing.

Relatedly, the GHGRP enhances market confidence by providing a credible emissions baseline that investors, insurers, and regulators can trust. This is especially important for businesses seeking to monetize tax credits through transferability or direct pay provisions, where third-party roles in validating emissions reductions are particularly valued.

Changes to the GHGRP could create uncertainty in tax credit administration and necessitate corresponding updates to the applicable IRS rules that would further complicate and delay ongoing investments. Maintaining reporting and verification per these data collection methodologies would support regulatory consistency, business planning, and long-term investment in emerging industries, including the responsible development and deployment of energy resources and technologies.

### 4. Streamlining Verification Requirements

Some American businesses have found that the GHGRP plays a role in superseding any mandated third-party verification by establishing standardized data collection and reporting protocols across industries. This standardization has had the effect of enhancing the credibility and comparability of emissions data, which is increasingly important in California, the EU, and under other jurisdictions' emissions disclosure regimes as they move toward mandatory third-party assurance of GHG inventories. For American businesses, a consistent nationwide program translates into lower reporting costs and faster verification timelines. Because companies within a given sector tend to report emissions using the same EPA-approved methodologies, third-party verifiers can apply a uniform review process without needing to learn or adapt to each company's unique internal or third-party systems. This reduces the time and effort required for verification, which in turn lowers the cost of assurance services, accelerates access to tax credits or regulatory approvals, and streamlines reporting under investor-based GHG disclosure platforms.

### 5. Informed Supply Chain Decisions

Data collected pursuant to the GHGRP plays a powerful role in supporting internal business planning and risk management by providing reliable and comparable decision-grade data. U.S. businesses frequently depend on data generated under the GHGRP to guide procurement decisions, assess the carbon intensity of their supply chains, and identify lower-carbon suppliers while maintaining cost competitiveness.

EPA's role in the program lends the data credibility that some institutional investors, ratings agencies, and sustainability reporting frameworks require. Financial institutions and corporate investors also currently use GHGRP data to assess climate-related financial risks, evaluate the exposure of potential investments, and support due diligence processes. Without access to this data framework, companies could face higher costs to obtain comparable emissions information from suppliers and business partners.

### C. EPA Should Take a Targeted Approach in Its Reconsideration of the GHGRP, Amending Rather than Ending the Program

As alternatives to rescission of the GHGRP, the Coalition respectfully offers the following approaches to help EPA achieve meaningful regulatory relief while also supporting the Administration's broader economic competitiveness goals:

#### 1. Eliminating Burdensome Elements of the GHGRP

A revision to rescind specific burdensome requirements of the GHGRP, while adding any useful improvements, would be a reasonable alternative to rescinding the GHGRP entirely and would reduce regulatory costs. Removing unnecessary elements and aligning requirements to evidence-based standard industry practice have the added benefit of establishing an improved federal program that could be incorporated by reference or recognized by state and international authorities, reducing burden not just for reporting to the EPA but to other jurisdictions. As an example, EPA should consider eliminating duplicative reporting provisions for sectors where data is already reported for compliance with other regulatory requirements, such as the electric utility data that is reported for compliance under 40 CFR Part 75 of the Acid Rain Program.

EPA must act expediently to address substantive concerns on the update to the GHGRP program by finalizing a rulemaking concerning Subpart W that would reconsider unaddressed industry comments on the May 14, 2024 rule,[21] and remove reporting of indirect emissions which offer no business benefit (Subpart MM/NN), all of which will provide regulatory relief while maintaining EPA's helpful certification role in collecting and maintaining standardized data and preserving the GHGRP's standardizing influence.

Targeted revisions could deliver meaningful regulatory relief while preserving program elements that serve useful business functions. These could include addressing concerns about the misapplication of factors and practices relevant to one segment to other segments (an example being the application of upstream-based adjustment factors to downstream segments such as distribution, which results in confusion and

[21] 89 Fed. Reg. 42,062 (May 14, 2024).

compliance challenges). Reducing requirements for monitoring and reporting insignificant sources of emissions, and revising monitoring and calibration practices more broadly, can also be considered.

#### 2. Narrowing Program Applicability

EPA could achieve substantial regulatory relief by focusing reporting requirements on facilities with the most significant emissions, reducing burdens for those already reporting under separate similar regulatory programs, and providing relief to smaller operations that face disproportionate compliance burdens. This approach would support the Administration's commitment to reducing regulatory burdens on small and medium-sized businesses, which often lack the administrative or financial resources to efficiently navigate complex reporting requirements.

The need for such targeted relief has become particularly apparent following the 2024 revisions to the GHGRP, which imposed disproportionate costs on smaller entities. In its Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis for the 2024 Subpart W revisions, EPA acknowledged that dozens of small entities would likely experience "significant impacts" with cost-to-revenue ratios exceeding three percent, and that some small entities could face compliance costs representing nearly five percent of their annual revenue.[22] While EPA's 2024 Subpart W final rule brushed aside those concerns, these findings demonstrate that the current program structure can impose excessive financial burdens on smaller businesses.

If EPA proceeds with its reconsideration of the GHGRP, the Agency could consider revising sector-specific applicability thresholds to ensure that reporting requirements are proportionate to facility size and emissions levels. This targeted approach would maintain data coverage for the largest emission sources—which provide the most value for business applications like tax credit administration and international trade compliance—while reducing unnecessary burdens on smaller companies.

### D. If EPA Broadly Rescinds the GHGRP, the Agency Should Consider Approaches to Mitigate Effects on Industry

If EPA were to move forward with broadly rescinding the program, the Coalition offers the following approaches to mitigate any adverse impacts associated with such a decision.

[22] 89 Fed. Reg. 42,062, 42,214 (May 14, 2024).

### 1. Consider a Voluntary Reporting Framework

If EPA were to proceed with rescinding the GHGRP, EPA should consider transforming portions of the GHGRP into a voluntary certification program that would provide regulatory relief while maintaining methodologies from the standardized federal program that have proven valuable to American businesses. Under this approach, companies could choose to voluntarily submit and certify their data according to EPA standards, preserving access to the reliable, government-sanctioned emissions data that supports tax credit eligibility, international trade requirements, supply chain management, and reporting under investor-based GHG disclosure frameworks.

Several states with reporting programs already make participation voluntary for certain source categories, demonstrating that this approach can work effectively.[23] This framework could maintain EPA's role for those businesses that find it important in establishing consistent methodologies while eliminating mandatory regulatory burdens for companies that do not need standardized data for business purposes. Such an approach could significantly reduce regulatory burden while preserving the GHG reporting infrastructure that supports American competitiveness in global markets.

### 2. Provide for an Orderly Transition

If EPA proceeds with its proposal to rescind nearly the entire program, then at a minimum, EPA should help minimize marketplace disruption by implementing program changes through a carefully managed transition period. Many businesses have developed significant operational and financial ties to GHGRP data and processes. Providing a one-year or longer transition period for any affected industry segments would allow companies to adjust their compliance systems and develop alternative data sources where necessary.

Also, coordinating with the Department of the Treasury and the IRS on implementation timing would be particularly valuable where tax regulations cross-reference GHGRP requirements, helping ensure that changes do not inadvertently disrupt tax credit programs that support domestic energy development. The Agency should also consider and take into account the interests that have developed around certain program elements, particularly where businesses have made investments based on the availability of standardized EPA data.

[23] *See, e.g.*, 5 Colo. Code Regs. 1001-26, Pt. A, § III.A.8 ("Any domestic wastewater treatment plant may voluntarily report GHGs."); *id.* § III.A.9 (similar voluntary reporting for any "agricultural operation").

## Conclusion

The Coalition appreciates the opportunity to comment on EPA's proposed reconsideration of the GHGRP and supports a balanced approach that reduces unnecessary regulatory burdens while preserving the value of standardized GHG data. Maintaining some form of reliable national reporting framework like the GHGRP will discourage a patchwork of state and local regulations, support American industry, and assist companies participating in the global economy. Please do not hesitate to reach out to Chad Whiteman, cwhiteman@uschamber.com, if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

U.S. Chamber of Commerce

Airlines for America

American Chemistry Council

American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute

American Exploration & Production Council

American Gas Association

American Petroleum Institute

Carbon Utilization Research Council

Clean Hydrogen Future Coalition

Colorado Oil & Gas Association

Corn Refiners Association

Council of Industrial Boiler Owners

Edison Electric Institute

Fuel Cell & Hydrogen Energy Association

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America

New Mexico Oil & Gas Association

Pennsylvania Independent Oil & Gas Association

Renewable Fuels Association

USLNG Association (LNG Allies)

Western Energy Alliance