

Message

From: Jones, Enesta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=65B8E6C6E5CA4A7A9AE85D98A4C8EEDB-EJONES02]
Sent: 6/29/2018 2:52:11 PM
To: Juli Berwald [Ex. 6]
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: Re: CFC Inquiry for EPA

Juli,

On background:

1. How did the “bank” of CFCs that fall outside of the Montreal Protocol come to be? Why were they not regulated under the Protocol?

Because they are ozone-depleting substances (ODS), CFCs are controlled under the international environmental treaty, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (<http://ozone.unep.org/en/handbook-montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/44>) and in the U.S. under Title VI of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1990 (<https://www.epa.gov/ozone-layer-protection/ozone-protection-under-title-vi-clean-air-act>). The US banned the production and import of CFCs in 1996 (<https://www.epa.gov/ods-phaseout/phaseout-class-i-ozone-depleting-substances>), and global production and consumption of CFCs ended in 2010 (<http://ozone.unep.org/en/handbook-montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/45>).

The principle approach of the Montreal Protocol and Title VI of the CAA to heal the stratospheric ozone layer is to reduce the amounts of CFCs, and other ozone-depleting substances, that are produced and imported gradually over time.

The term “banks” of ODS refers to amounts that are installed in equipment or products (e.g., foam products, air-conditioners) or stockpiled.

2. Where could I find the best assessment of the quantity of these CFCs?

One source of information about banks of ozone-depleting substances can be found in these documents from the Montreal Protocol including its advisory body, the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP):

[http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/meeting/oewg/oewg-36/presession/Background%20Documents%20are%20available%20in%20English%20only/TEAP Assessment report 2014.pdf](http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/meeting/oewg/oewg-36/presession/Background%20Documents%20are%20available%20in%20English%20only/TEAP%20Assessment%20report%202014.pdf)

http://ozone.unep.org/en/Assessment_Panels/TEAP/Reports/Other_Task_Force/TEAP02V3a.pdf

http://ozone.unep.org/en/Assessment_Panels/TEAP/Reports/TEAP_Reports/teap-supplement-ippc-teap-report-nov2005.pdf

3. Where could I find information about where they are located?

We don't track that information in the U.S. or globally.

4. What do you see as the best way to deal with the CFCs that were not in the bank today?

EPA declines to comment.

5. Destruction as a verified carbon credit is an option. Do you see this as a good opportunity? Why or why not?

EPA declines to comment.

6. What problems dealing with the bank so CFCs aren't emitted into the atmosphere do you see as the most significant?

EPA declines to comment.

7. Can you recommend anyone else for me to speak with about CFCs that fall outside the Montreal Protocol?

Given your specific interest in the recent paper by Montzka et al. in *Nature* (<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0106-2>), we suggest that you may want to contact the author, Dr. Stephen A. Montzka with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), directly by clicking on his name in the above webpage.

On Jun 6, 2018, at 4:04 PM, Juli Berwald < **Ex. 6** > wrote:

Hi Enesta,

Thanks for being in touch. I'm still in the research portion of my work so a conversation would really be preferable. I'm happy to talk with anyone who has experience with CFCs and how they are tracked and regulated.

Here are some of the questions I have

1. How did the "bank" of CFCs that fall outside of the Montreal Protocol come to be? Why were they not regulated under the Protocol?
2. Where could I find the best assessment of the quantity of these CFCs?
3. Where could I find information about where they are located?
4. What do you see as the best way to deal with the CFCs that were not in the bank today?
5. Destruction as a verified carbon credit is an option. Do you see this as a good opportunity? Why or why not?
6. What problems dealing with the bank so CFCs aren't emitted into the atmosphere do you see as the most significant?
7. Can you recommend anyone else for me to speak with about CFCs that fall outside the Montreal Protocol?

If I could have your answer by June 30, I would appreciate it.

Thanks,
Juli

Juli Berwald
juliberwald.com
SPINELESS

On Jun 6, 2018, at 9:15 AM, Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Julie,

I'm reaching out re your inquiry below. Please send specific questions and hard deadline.

Thanks,
Enesta

From: Juli Berwald <Ex. 6>
Date: June 5, 2018 at 6:04:12 PM EDT
To: maranion.bella@epa.gov
Subject: CFC bank

Hi Bella,

I am a freelance science writer following climate change stories and I have been interested in CFCs that fall outside the controls of the Montreal Protocol. I was particularly interested in a paper by Montzka et al. in Nature recently (<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0106-2>) suggesting a new (and mysterious) source of CFC production in Southeast Asia. I'd be interested to talk with you about your thoughts on that possibility, as well as others.

Would you be available for a phone call next week?

Thanks!
Juli

Juli Berwald