

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

Control of Air Pollution From)	Docket No.: EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0827
New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty)	NHTSA-2014-0132
Engine and Vehicle Standards)	
)	Public Hearing: April 12, 2022

**ORAL STATEMENT OF THE
TRUCK AND ENGINE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION**

I am Jed Mandel speaking today on behalf of the Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association (EMA). Our members manufacture the medium and heavy-duty engines and vehicles that are the subject of today’s rule. EMA and its members support the adoption of a stringent single-step reduced NO_x standard, a low-load cycle, enhanced in-use test procedures, and cost-effective improvements to extended emission warranty and useful life periods. We also support a program that can be a successful bridge to a zero-emission commercial vehicle future – for which EMA members are investing billions – and we support EPA’s proceeding with a Phase 3 GHG rule. We are significantly aligned with and supportive of EPA’s goals.

That said, EPA’s proposed rule is not technologically feasible, cost-effective or customer acceptable. As a result, critically important fleet turnover will be delayed and customers will keep their higher emitting trucks longer. That not only will delay EPA’s anticipated environmental benefits, it also would cause environmental backsliding which would be especially harmful to disadvantaged communities (and which would undermine environmental justice goals that we support). Further, a poorly designed final rule will cause market disruptions, will delay or undermine the ability of manufacturers to recoup their investment in developing compliant technologies and, worse, could have significant adverse impacts on the economy and jobs. Finally, a poorly designed final rule could force manufacturers to divert resources needed for ZEV and GHG research and development.

We are committed to working with EPA and other stakeholders to assure adoption of a final rule that is appropriately stringent, that will address the nation’s needs for reducing heavy-duty on-highway diesel engines’ NO_x contribution to ozone formation, and that will still provide our customers a full range of durable, reliable, and affordable products. We believe that Option 2 provides a starting point for achieving those goals, although modifications are needed. But, I can tell you right now that Option 1 simply is not the answer. Option 1’s stringency goes beyond the detection capability of available technology and will result in false failures, and recalls, for otherwise compliant products. Manufacturers, in turn, will be forced to invest to try to mitigate those risks, thereby further diverting resources from ZEV and GHG development.

Finally, we are surprised and disappointed that EPA is considering reopening the GHG Phase 2 final rule. As you know, EMA and its members defended that rule, and opposed its being reopened under the previous Administration to make it less stringent. We similarly are opposed to it being reopened now to make it more stringent. Our members count on the stability and certainty of EPA's final rules. That is the basis for their investing capital and making business plans for compliance. Reopening Phase 2 not only undermines those investments and plans, but also would set a horrible precedent that future Administrations can change rules they don't like, thereby eviscerating regulatory certainty and stability.