

Message

From: Graham, Amy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=26722DFDE5B34925B0AD9A8DD4AFF308-GRAHAM, AMY]
Sent: 7/11/2017 10:32:22 PM
To: [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: RE: methane
Flag: Follow up

Hi John – Enesta passed along your email. Here is our response:

“EPA follows the law when ensuring the Agency’s actions are consistent with our core mission and statutory authority granted by Congress. Where regulations may be unjustified or overly burdensome, we will consider all legally available means to provide regulatory certainty.” - Amy Graham, EPA spokesperson

Thanks,
Amy

From: John McQuaid [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 4:09 PM
To: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: methane

Hello Ernesta:

I'm a journalist writing a piece for Scientific American regarding the EPA suspension of the methane rule and other of published federal rules (including the pesticide applicator rule, ozone standards, et al).

Had some brief questions I was hoping to get a response on:

1. What is the latest EPA response to last week's Circuit Court ruling on the methane rule, what happens now?
2. Are these suspensions part of a broader agency effort to reevaluate and / or roll back existing Obama-era regulatory actions?
3. If so, what's the overall aim, or thinking behind this?
4. I've spoken to some legal scholars who say that sometimes these are hastily implemented without meeting legal requirements (as also reflected by the recent methane rule decision). Is this something the agency is working to address in future suspensions or reviews?

Any help appreciated.

Thanks and regards,

John McQuaid

Scientific American

2 [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**