

**From:** Ewing Tom [Ex. 6]  
**Sent:** 5/7/2018 5:33:14 PM  
**To:** Jones, Enesta [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=65b8e6c6e5ca4a7a9ae85d98a4c8eedb-EJones02]  
**CC:** Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]  
**Subject:** Re: EPA Responses re SNAP Rule and Stakeholder Meeting

Thank you very much, Enesta. I appreciate your (good!) work.

TE

---

**From:** "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>  
**To:** [Ex. 6]  
**Cc:** Press <Press@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 7, 2018 12:55 PM  
**Subject:** EPA Responses re SNAP Rule and Stakeholder Meeting

Tom,

**On background:**

**1. How many people registered for the meeting? How many attended?**

Approximately 100 people registered for the meeting. There were approximately 130 total attendees at the meeting, including EPA staff.

**2. Is there an agenda for the meeting - either formal or informal? Please send a copy of the agenda.**

The agenda and meeting handout is attached.

**3. Please send copies of any meeting handouts.**

Attached, please see #2 above.

**4. Who was the most senior EPA official at the meeting? Did Administrator Pruitt attend? Did he participate in discussions or Q&A? Did officials from other federal agencies attend and participate, e.g., DOE or OMB?**

Bill Wehrum, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation. Staff from other government agencies also attended.

**5. Who facilitated the meeting?**

Sarah Dunham, Office Director of the Office of Atmospheric Programs, opened the meeting and moderated the open dialogue segment, and Cindy Newberg, Division Director of the Stratospheric Protection Division, made a presentation on the SNAP program and participated in the discussion.

**6. At the close of the meeting, what next steps were agreed upon or otherwise established? Did EPA present our outline any kind of a schedule (even a rough schedule, say, hoping to conclude this issue in 12-16 months) for this set of topics? If so, what is that timeline and what is the goal at the end of the timeline?**

EPA held this meeting to enable stakeholders to provide input as the Agency prepares to engage in rulemaking to address the court's remand of the SNAP 2015 Rule. EPA listened to stakeholders and will consider the points made in the meeting as the rulemaking moves forward.

**7. Does that mean that if a company used a HFC/HCFC compound listed as "acceptable" in 2014, but then newly listed as "unacceptable" within the 2015 Rule, that now, in 2018, because the listings won't be applied, that company could again, legally, use that same compound?**

The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the case of *Mexichem Fluor, Inc. v. EPA* vacated the 2015 SNAP Rule "to the extent it requires manufacturers to replace HFCs with a substitute substance" and remanded the rule to EPA for further proceedings. EPA will not apply the HFC use restrictions or unacceptability listings in the 2015 Rule for any purpose prior to completion of rulemaking. Thus, companies can currently use HFC compounds that were listed as "unacceptable" within the 2015 Rule. The HCFC listings were not challenged and were not addressed by the court, so EPA is choosing in the near term to continue upholding these provisions as remaining in effect.

**8. Also, the Mexichem Fluor case centers around EPA's listing of compounds that could impact global warming. Yet the 04/27/19 guidance makes no mention of climate change or global warming and how that topic influenced the addition of compounds to the 2015 list. Not sure how to phrase this question but why is that 800 lb gorilla (climate change - global warming) missing as a topic, or at least a reference, within the 04/27 guidance?**

We decline to comment.