Climate Action Tracker Summary
Projected effect of Trump Administration policy changes on US emissions

Policy Obama Administration Trump Administration Projected effect of change
-

Climate Action Plan

Renaissance target

Target: double renewable energy by 2020 (from 2013)
Climate Action Plan rescinded
No effect, target expected to be reached independently of federal policies.
-

Climate Action Plan

Energy efficiency target

Target: double energy productivity (defined as GDP per energy use) by 2030 in comparison to 2010
Climate Action Plan rescinded
Target will be missed with implemented policies—energy productivity in 2030 is expected to be about 1.5 times higher than in 2010 (EIA calculation).
-

Clean Power Plan (CPP)

The CPP aims to reduce emissions from the power sector to 32% below 2005 levels by 2030 by setting targets for each state individually. Proposed in 2014, announced as an in August 2015 after an extended phase of public consultation. The U.S. Supreme Court blocked the CPP in February 2016, and the D.C. circuit court with jurisdiction over the case passed in August 2017. 19 states support the Clean Power Plan (CPP).

In response to President Trump’s Executive Order on Energy Independence, the EPA is reviewing the CPP:

If the CPP is rescinded and states or other sectors do not compensate for emissions, would be up to 200 MTCO2e higher in 2025 (2.8% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF) and up to 365 MTCO2e higher in 2030 (5.3% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF) above our current policy scenario (EIA calculation).

Individual states, regions, cities and companies may step in to provide similar or even stronger incentives for energy efficiency, renewable energy and other low carbon energy, but the possible effect was not quantified.
-

Performance standards for new, modified, and reconstructed electric generating units

Standards set in August 2015

In response to President Trump’s Executive Order on Energy Independence, the EPA is reviewing performance standards
Likely to have negligible effect on emissions (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015).
-

Emissions standards for cars and light-duty trucks

Emissions standards for light-duty vehicles set for model years 2017–2025 in 2012 (final rule set for model years 2017–2021, and estimated standards for model year 2022, which are to be finalized after a midterm evaluation)
EPA and NHTSA are reviewing emissions standards for model years 2022–2025
If the standards for 2022–2025 are rolled back and the fleet stays at the 2021 standard level, emissions could increase by 22 MTCO2e in 2025 (0.3% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF). Emissions could rise 9.2 MTCO2e (~0.1% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF) above our current policy scenario (EIA calculation).
-

Federal coal leases

Moratorium on new coal leases on federal lands

Department of the Interior lifted moratorium on new coal leases in March 2017
Impact on emissions under—250 coal plants have retired or committed to retire since 2010, and only 8% of coal generation continues (Sens. Energy & Natural Resources Committee, 2017). Competition from natural gas and the growth of renewable energy have contributed to US coal industry decline (Preuss et al., 2017).
-

Climate Action Plan

HPCs

Target: cut HFC use at home and abroad with implemented HFC reductions through the Significant Alternatives Program (SNAP) in 2015
Climate Action Plan rescinded
No action on SNAP rule

Climate Action Plan

Methane

Target: reduce methane emissions from oil and gas production by 40–45% below 2005 levels by 2025
Climate Action Plan rescinded
Target will not be met under the current policy scenario.

Methane reporting requirements

EPA sent out an Information Collection Request in 2016 that required the oil and gas industry to provide information on equipment and methane emissions at existing facilities
EPA withdrew the request in March 2017
The request would have built the foundation to regulate emissions from existing facilities, making it more difficult to introduce policies to limit these emissions in the future.
-

Social cost of carbon (SCC) for policy and regulatory assessments

From a traditional US SCC estimated released in 2010—updated several times since
Trump Administration is reviewing estimates of the SCC and has withdrawn technical guidance documents for agencies on how to implement it
SCC gives benefits from reducing CO2 emissions a monetary value, which can be used in cost-benefit analyses to help justify policies that reduce emissions. If the Trump Administration assumes that there is no social value of CO2 emissions, it will make it more difficult to reduce new emissions to improve our quality of life and protect future generations.
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1 As defined by the U.S. Department of Energy.
2 https://www.eenews.net/interactive/clean_power_plan#legal_challenge_status

Impact on emissions under—250 coal plants have retired or committed to retire since 2010, and only 8% of coal generation continues (Sens. Energy & Natural Resources Committee, 2017). Competition from natural gas and the growth of renewable energy have contributed to US coal industry decline (Preuss et al., 2017).

Meeting the full target would have reduced emissions by 90–150 MTCO2e in 2025 (~1.3% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF) and 100–135 MTCO2e in 2030 (~1.9–2.1% of total 2005 emissions excl. LULUCF) above our current policy scenario (EIA calculation).

Withdrawing it makes it more difficult to introduce policies to limit these emissions in the future.

SCC gives benefits from reducing CO2 emissions a monetary value, which can be used in cost-benefit analyses to help justify policies that reduce emissions. If the Trump Administration assumes that there is no social value of CO2 emissions, it will make it more difficult to reduce new emissions to improve our quality of life and protect future generations.