Testimony of Charles Hernick, Vice President of Policy and Advocacy,

Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions (CRES)

To the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

For the Hearing "The Business Case for Climate Solutions"

Wednesday, March 17th, 2021, 11:00 a.m. EDT

Chairman DeFazio, Ranking Member Graves, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on "The Business Case for Climate Solutions."

My name is Charles Hernick, and I am the Vice President of Policy and Advocacy for Citizens for Responsible Energy Solution (CRES). We are a 501(c)(4) non-profit that engages policymakers and the public about responsible, conservative solutions to address our nation's energy, economic, and environmental security while increasing America's competitive edge.

I hope you will remember *three approaches for how to reduce emissions* from my testimony:

1. So there is no confusion, it is worth stating that the time for additional climate action is now. I say additional because the federal government is not the only entity interested or capable of tackling the climate challenge. Indeed, many companies, states, and municipalities have been hard at work for decades. And Congress must remember that we live in an era where even in the depths of a pandemic, companies large and small have voluntarily committed to carbon neutrality by definitive dates. Therefore, the federal policy playbook should first and foremost **harness the power of free markets**—by encouraging transparency and accountability— and empower companies to achieve their self-set goals, not pursue heavy-handed, top-down mandates that drive up costs or reduce options.

2. There is a meaningful role for the federal government in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. But rather than picking winners and losers, federal policy is better positioned to **make strategic investments in research and development (R&D) and infrastructure** that serves an *all-of-the-above* approach including fuel efficiency, new clean fuels like hydrogen, and electrification (i.e., electric vehicles). The federal government should focus on backbone infrastructure for the economy and leave room for states to innovate on policies that are locally appropriate.

3. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, if we are to tackle the climate challenge quickly, Congress will need to **reduce or eliminate barriers to infrastructure development**. It should take two years, not ten years, to permit infrastructure projects. Red tape is not the price of good government; it is the enemy of good government. America could modernize its infrastructure, reduce costs, while dramatically enhancing environmental benefits, with a two-year approval process for large construction projects. Among other regulatory reforms, a single permitting timetable and timely environmental reviews and authorization decisions must be a first-order priority, specifically codifying One Federal Decision. The public agrees. Our polling shows that a significant percent of voters (73 percent) support streamlining and reforming government regulations that hamper the transition to clean energy.[1]

The Surface Transportation Advanced through Reform, Technology & Efficient Review Act, or *STARTER Act*, introduced in the 116th Congress, was an important effort towards reducing barriers and making targeted investments. Thank you, Ranking Member Graves, for your leadership to ensure state flexibility by preserving state decision-making and rejecting new

[1] Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions (CRES). *Poll: Republican, Democratic Voters Support Commonsense, "All-of-the-Above" Climate Solutions*. https://citizensfor.com/pressreleases/poll-republican-democratic-voters-support-commonsense-all-of-the-above-climate-solutions/.

federal mandates that would dictate funding priorities regardless of actual local needs. My hope is that Congress can build on your effort and pass bipartisan infrastructure legislation to put transportation sector emissions on the right trajectory.

Framing: Big Government Is Not a Pre-Requisite for Successful Climate Policy

Before we can develop an actionable business case for climate solutions, we must first determine how success will be defined.

Another multi-trillion dollar bill out of Congress will not be a sign of success. Capital markets—driven by large investors and common stockholders alike—are trained on delivering a low-carbon future. Investors like Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, Bank of America, HSBC, Morgan Stanley, and Barclays have all committed to net-zero portfolios by mid-century.[2] More investors are factoring climate change into their portfolios, and it is easier than ever for Americans to align their 401(k) plans with a carbon-free future. There is no shortage of finance for mature clean energy technologies. Trillions in scattershot federal spending could crowd-out private sector investment. First and foremost, we should measure the success of our climate policy based on how well it encourages, not competes, with investment from America's financial industry.

Second, we know that low-cost, low-emissions technologies and goods will be critical to successful climate policy.[3] Anything short of widespread adoption will fail to address this global issue, and American innovation will be the key driver. Inexpensive climate solutions are needed for global uptake in developing countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, where too many people still lack basic services. Our geopolitical adversaries are willing to undercut American

[2] American University. *Carbon Removal Corporate Action Tracker*. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vf--uXsf6fo7MuNpPya2Kz82Dxte0hHgtOXimgpRA3c/edit#gid=0.
[3] See more about CRES Forum's Climate Policy Directives at: https://cresforum.org/climate-policy-directives/.

interests no matter what the implications are for climate change. That is why the bipartisan *Energy Act of 2020* was such an important down payment on energy innovation. Affordability also matters here at home. The impacts of the pandemic-induced recession have not been evenly distributed across America, nor are historic environmental burdens or the likely economic and health impacts of effects of climate change. Price increases make life even harder for these Americans. We can measure the success of our climate policy based on the availability of new energy innovations and whether they are priced for easy and widespread adoption.

Third, effective climate policy will rely on the power of free markets. Big government mandates favor incumbent technologies and large companies and are blind to what the free market can do. Additional bureaucracy is disproportionately threatening to small businesses and start-ups. Appetite for clean energy—by people and companies—has been growing steadily for decades and as a result, the private sector and effective state-level policies have achieved the goals of President Obama's Clean Power Plan carbon reductions 10 years ahead of time.[4] Indeed, it is a favorable American business environment that gives space for a record number of companies to put themselves on a path to net zero and differentiate themselves on "clean." Congress should encourage more of that race to the top, and successful climate policy can be measured based on whether the free market is incentivizing behavior and activities that support our climate goals.

And finally, America's interests and American jobs should be our number one priority when developing a clean transportation infrastructure for the next century. The U.S. is more energy independent than we have been in decades and we should not lose that in the race to reduce emissions. This means that we need to address the entire supply chain of materials and

[4] Bloomberg NEF and Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE). *Sustainable Energy in America 2021. Factbook*. https://bcse.org/factbook/.

technologies. Domestically sourced critical minerals and metals utilized by domestic manufacturing facilities could supply the development of a clean transportation sector at home and abroad. It is encouraging that new battery plants are being built in the U.S. to align vehicle supply chains with the domestic market. After a generation of hemorrhaging industrial jobs overseas, this realignment will take some time. We can directly measure the effectiveness of our climate policy in our job numbers, manufacturing metrics, the security of our supply chain, and our Gross Domestic Product.

1. Harness the Power of Free Markets

When history books are written about how we solved the climate problem, these years of the global COVID-19 pandemic will be a surprising turning point.

At the close of 2020, the COVID relief and year-end omnibus also included a broad modernization of our nation's energy policies. *The Energy Act of 2020* was the culmination of many years of significant bipartisan effort and marks the first comprehensive energy legislation passed in over a decade. It combined bipartisan provisions from the Senate (*S. 2657 American Energy Innovation Act*) and House (*H.R. 4447 Clean Energy Jobs and Innovation Act*) bills and reflects the priorities of many members of Congress to accelerate the development of technologies needed to meet our environmental and economic challenges. The Act provides a timely and critical investment in the advancements in energy efficiency, energy storage, advanced nuclear, carbon capture, carbon removal, renewable energy, and other approaches needed to decarbonize our economy. Importantly, it brought bipartisan compromise on the phaseout of hydrofluorocarbons, which are greenhouse gases with extremely high warming potential.

The $900-billion package could inject at least $34 billion in low-carbon spending into the country's economy over the next decade.[5] It contains more than $19 billion in the form of new authorizations on clean energy research, development, and demonstration by the Department of Energy, including $6.8 billion for nuclear, $5.3 billion for carbon capture, use and storage, and $1 billion for energy storage. Congress should fully appropriate these funds. The package also added an estimated $15 billion over 10 years in new federal tax credit enhancements on top of existing credits.

As COVID-19 is brought more under control over the course of 2021, the economy will further rebound. The case for additional stimulus is limited, and overspending risks overheating the economy.

Leading businesses are making important commitments and strides to reduce emissions: there is a new, encouraging baseline.

There are three basic ways to reduce emissions from the transportation sector: increase (fuel) efficiency, better utilize low- or zero-emissions fuels, and pursue electric vehicles. Companies across the U.S. economy voluntarily committed to renewable energy, as evidenced by more than 10.6 GW of corporate renewable energy purchases occurring in 2020, according to the Renewable Energy Buyers Alliance.[6] Companies across retail, big tech, and hospitality, among other sectors, have stepped up and made voluntary commitments to decarbonize their operations, and that is also translating to a transportation or fleet electrification strategy.

[5] Bloomberg NEF and Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE). *Sustainable Energy in America 2021 Factbook*. https://bcse.org/factbook/.
[6] Ben German. "Ranking 2020's corporate clean energy deals." *Axios*, February 11, 2020. https://www.axios.com/renewable-energy-companies-amazon-google-18db639c-e1e5-416f-8887-848e601131c6.html.

Traditionally, fuel economy has focused on increasing the miles per gallon (mpg) of the internal combustion engine. Internal combustion engines will always emit carbon emissions as a product of the combustion process. But with current technologies, it is possible to reduce, and perhaps someday fully decarbonize, the sector. Oil and gas companies are focused on reducing upstream emissions, as well as sequestering and offsetting carbon. Despite incredible economic challenges this past year, oil and gas majors Total and Royal Dutch Shell announced ambitious plans to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, echoing similar announcements made by BP and Repsol in 2019. Total, for example, aims to achieve net-zero Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2050 and it is targeting carbon neutrality for all its Scope 3 production and energy products sold in Europe by 2050.[7] Oxy Low Carbon Ventures, a subsidiary of Houston based Occidental Petroleum, delivered its first batch of "carbon-neutral oil" this past January.[8] Fueling up with carbon-neutral gasoline can only be part of the future through an all-of-the-above approach that is open to innovation in all sectors.

Government does not need to mandate this behavior; companies are adopting it themselves to meet consumer demand. Zero-emission fossil fuels can be an important tool for climate policy as we transition to cleaner energy sources, but only if we make it possible for oil and gas companies to deliver on those promises. Government can do that by removing barriers that currently inhibit transparency, certainty, and trust in carbon offset markets—no mandate is required.

---

[7] Francois De Beaupuy. "Oil Giant Total Targets Carbon Neutrality in 2050." *Bloomberg Green*, May 5, 2020. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-05-05/total-targets-carbon-neutrality-in-2050-as-profit-plunges-35?cmpid=BBD051220_GREENDAILY&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&utm_term=200512&utm_campaign=greendaily

[8] Eklavya Gupte and Paula VanLaningham. "US' Occidental supplies first cargo of 'carbon-neutral crude' to India's Reliance." *S&P Global*, January 29, 2021. https://www.spglobal.com/platts/en/market-insights/latest-news/oil/012921-us-occidental-supplies-first-cargo-of-carbon-neutral-crude-to-indias-reliance.

Another cost-efficient way to significantly reduce emissions in vehicle fleets is by switching to low-emissions fuels such as natural gas or propane. Propane is a promising alternative fuel in the transportation sector for a number of reasons:

- *Cost savings.* While the energy content of propane is lower than that of gasoline or diesel,[9] propane has a lower fuel cost per mile, given its lower cost of the fuel itself and the lower maintenance costs for propane-fueled vehicles.[10] The Propane Research and Education Council estimates that propane vehicle fleets can represent between 30 and 50 percent in cost savings, compared with their gasoline and diesel counterparts.[11] For example, when the Oak Harbor Public School District in Washington state replaced its diesel and gasoline school buses in 2010 with a propane fleet, it achieved an estimated annual savings of $35,000 in fuel costs and an additional $700 in reduced vehicle maintenance and service time.[12]
- *Emissions reductions*. In 2019, a study from West Virginia University found that propane school buses reduce emissions of nitrogen oxide by 96 percent, and of carbon dioxide by 13 percent, compared to diesel-fueled buses.[13]

[9] 84,250 Btu/gal for propane, versus 112,114–116,090 Btu/gal for gasoline and 128,488 Btu/gal for diesel. Alternative Fuels Data Center. "Fuel Properties Comparison." Department of Energy, January 2021. https://afdc.energy.gov/files/u/publication/fuel_comparison_chart.pdf.
[10] Propane Research and Education Council. "Driving down costs." 2020. https://propane.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Superior-Plus-Propane-Case-Study.pdf. See also National Propane Gas Association. "Today's Propane." 2020. https://www.npga.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/NPGA-Todays-Propane-2019.pdf.
[11] Propane Research and Education Council. "Top 10 Facts About Propane Autogas for Fleet Managers." September 16, 2018. https://propane.com/2018/09/16/top-10-facts-about-propane-autogas-for-fleet-managers/.
[12] Alternative Fuels Data Center. "Washington School District Cuts Costs and Improves Air Quality with Propane Buses." April 09, 2019. https://afdc.energy.gov/case/3075.
[13] Propane Research and Education Council. "West Virginia University study finds propane school buses dramatically decrease harmful emissions." August 5, 2019. https://propane.com/environment/stories/west-virginia-university-study-finds-propane-school-buses-dramatically-decrease-harmful-emissions/.

- *Energy security.* Around 90 percent of the propane and natural gas used in the United States is produced domestically,[14] so it is a fuel source that does not imply dependence on foreign nations.

Outside of fossil fuels, electric vehicles make more sense than ever before and continue to be key to a cost-effective, consumer-driven approach to reducing emissions from transportation. Even though they are still a small percentage of cars on U.S. roads, widespread adoption may not be far off thanks to heightened innovation and more favorable federal and state policies. Costs for electric vehicles are coming down each year, charging at home is less expensive, recharging options and locations are growing, and limited lifetime maintenance costs are appealing. Many drivers are already saving money in the long run, with approximately $800-$1,000 in savings per year on fuel alone.[15] The best role for government is to simply allow the market to match transportation options with consumer needs. Steady federal policy, innovative state programs and more choices for consumers will keep pressure on lowering prices while also lowering emissions.

There are lessons to learn from the electric power sector for transportation: the clean energy business is unstoppable.

For over a decade, electric power sector emissions have steadily decreased. This is not the case for the transportation sector, which has been the largest source of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions since 2016. Except for 2020, due to the pandemic, transportation emissions have been

[14] Propane Research and Education Council. "Top 10 Facts About Propane Autogas for Fleet Managers." September 16, 2018. https://propane.com/2018/09/16/top-10-facts-about-propane-autogas-for-fleet-managers/. See also U.S. Energy Information Administration. "In 2018, 90% of the natural gas used in the United States was produced domestically." July 09, 2019. https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=40052.

[15] Benjamin Preston. "EVs Offer Big Savings Over Traditional Gas-Powered Cars." *Consumer Reports*, October 08, 2020. https://www.consumerreports.org/hybrids-evs/evs-offer-big-savings-over-traditional-gas-powered-cars/#:~:text=Fuel%20savings%3A%20The%20study%20shows,an%20equivalent%20gasoline%2Dpowered%20car.

steadily rising. So as attention focuses on decarbonizing transportation, we should consider lessons learned from the power sector.

In 2020, the U.S. renewable energy sector grew 11 percent and added 27.8 gigawatts of capacity to meet this surging demand for clean energy.[16] Solar and wind power had record years, respectively, and now Americans receive 20 percent of their electricity from renewable sources, including hydropower. These remarkable trends are due to abundant options for low-cost, low- or zero-emissions power generation available to the private sector. And they are the result of decades-long federal support for innovation and early-stage deployment, tax incentives for nascent industries, and complementary state policy.

As targeted federal investments continue to pay off in transportation, we should expect free-market forces to continue to drive transformation in the sector. Americans are interested in low-carbon solutions and empowering them to make those decisions would be popular. A recent CRES poll found that over 60 percent of Americans—including nearly half of Republicans—support a federal consumer-oriented system that would help make transparent which companies have followed through on their commitments to report and reduce emissions.[17] *Normalizing transparency* and reporting for sustainability markets such as voluntary carbon trading will help drive competition and investment.

America's private and public sectors have made great strides in deploying clean energy and reducing emissions, but there is currently no way for these accomplishments to be

[16] Bloomberg NEF and Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE). *Sustainable Energy in America 2021 Factbook*. https://bcse.org/factbook/.
[17] Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions (CRES). *Poll: Republican, Democratic Voters Support Commonsense, "All-of-the-Above" Climate Solutions*. https://citizensfor.com/pressreleases/poll-republican-democratic-voters-support-commonsense-all-of-the-above-climate-solutions/.

documented and organized so that their collective impact can be better understood by investors and consumers.

Normalizing systems for carbon reporting will increase transparency and accountability, increase investment in clean energy and offsets, and further decrease U.S. greenhouse gas emissions without imposing unnecessary mandates, costs, or bureaucracy.

This type of limited federal effort could help protect investors and maintain fair and orderly functioning of voluntary carbon markets. State compliance markets would still need their own enforcement mechanisms. But for private actors in the voluntary carbon space, following federal transparency and reporting guidance could crowd-in investment the way that Energy Star mainstreamed energy efficiency in the early 1990s through a voluntary program. Perhaps most importantly, government can facilitate certainty and trust in voluntary, industry-established greenhouse gas emissions registries and bring greater definition to tradable carbon offsets without inventing a new federal system that attempts to supersede state progress.

In addition to helping industry meet climate change goals, this framework for carbon transparency would help U.S. companies outcompete foreign rivals, particularly Chinese companies that depend on high-carbon sources of energy for industry. Indeed, our polling shows that 72 percent of all voters, and 61 percent of Republicans, support requiring both foreign and domestic companies to label their products based on the type of energy used in production, and equal numbers support requiring government contractors to disclose carbon emissions in the production of their goods and materials.[18] Consumers want to know that their hard-earned dollars support companies that do not harm the planet. Providing easy access to that information will

[18] Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions (CRES). *Poll: Republican, Democratic Voters Support Commonsense, "All-of-the-Above" Climate Solutions*. https://citizensfor.com/pressreleases/poll-republican-democratic-voters-support-commonsense-all-of-the-above-climate-solutions/.

drive business back to American industry, boosting American jobs, our economy, and our national security.

2. Make Strategic Investments

Transportation infrastructure is central to our economy, our way of life, and our standard of living. However, much of our nation's infrastructure is in disrepair and in need of massive re-investment. Modernizing America's infrastructure should include investments in more efficient technologies, smart and reliable "clean energy-ready" power grids, and cleaner, more efficient transportation systems. When planning infrastructure investments, the federal government should help accelerate emissions reductions by prioritizing clean energy projects, including those that reduce highway-related emissions, and promoting public-private partnerships to build out alternative fuel infrastructure. Notable legislation that accomplishes these goals includes but is not limited to:

- Provisions on ***cost-effective deployment of resilient infrastructure and mitigation strategies (Title VII) and accelerated project delivery (Title I-Subtitle B)***, included in the Surface Transportation Advanced through Reform, Technology & Efficient Review Act, or STARTER Act (*H.R. 7248*).
- ***Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) Grant Program*** (*Sec. 7001 of H.R. 7248 STARTER Act; Sec. 1407 of S. 2302 ATIA*) that would allow states to make resiliency improvements and help protect roads and bridges from natural disasters such as wildfires, hurricanes, floods, and mudslides.

- ***Electric Vehicle Mobility Area Planning Act (EV MAP Act)***. The EV MAP Act would create a grant program to map optimal locations for electric vehicle charging stations, giving private developers and consumers the information necessary to strategically invest in new charging infrastructure.
- ***Other Emissions Reduction Provisions*** (*S. 2302 ATIA Subtitle D-Climate Change, Sec. 1404, 1402, 1406 &1408).* Supports the development of a suite of options to reduce emissions across the transportation sector. These multifaceted solutions can include the authorization of a new program to help states reduce truck idling at ports (ATIA Sec. 1402; H.R. 2 Sec. 33191), the creation of a grant to support innovative, multimodal solutions to congestion relief (ATIA Sec. 1404), and the reauthorization of the Diesel Emissions Reduction Program (ATIA Sec. 1408; H.R. 2 Sec. 33301).
- ***Competitive Grants for Alternative Fuel Infrastructure*** *(Sec. 1303 of H.R. 2; Sec. 1401 of S. 2302 ATIA)* would help states and localities to build hydrogen, natural gas, and electric vehicle fueling infrastructure along designated highway corridors, which lack such infrastructure.
- ***Carbon Reduction Incentive Programs*** *(Sec. 1213 of H.R. 2; Sec. 1403 of S. 2302* ATIA) would distribute funds to states for projects that will yield significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from surface transportation and will help states meet emissions reductions goals.

3. Streamline Regulation and the Permitting Process

Minimizing administrative burdens and duplicative regulations promotes better environmental decision-making in a much more cost- and time-efficient manner. The complexity

of current U.S. permitting processes leaves substantial opportunities for improvement that would increase predictability, shorten the time to project delivery, and reduce costs while still providing for robust consideration of public and environmental concerns. Historically, there has been strong bipartisan support for incremental and common-sense improvements to the environmental review and permitting process, and we encourage the following initiatives to promote better environmental policy decision-making. The permitting process must be reformed to ensure effective stewardship of taxpayer resources—to scale clean energy rapidly and to create good-paying American jobs.

As introduced by Representative Davis, codifying the "One Federal Decision" (Executive Order 13807) through the One Federal Decision Act would consolidate permitting decisions for major infrastructure projects into a single environmental document, completed within two years, with a review schedule set by the federal lead agency. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) could be further modernized through proposals such as the Building U.S. Infrastructure through Limited Delays & Efficient Reviews (BUILDER) Act (H.R. 8333) (Rep. Graves (R-LA)). This legislation's overriding goal is to provide better environmental decisions in a cost- and time-efficient manner. Codifying this careful NEPA modernization will bring a higher level of certainty to critical infrastructure projects, enabling planned clean energy construction to move forward while continuing to adhere to important environmental standards.

Additionally, legislative proposals such as Rep. Kelly Armstrong and Sen. Portman's Federal Permitting Reform and Jobs Act should be included in any infrastructure proposal. *Fast 41 is a model of how permitting should be done, scheduled to expire in December 2022.*

As an example of how a voluntary mechanism for streamlining the federal permitting process can yield promising results, I will briefly mention Title 41 of the Fixing America's

Surface Transportation Act (FAST-41) of 2015, or FAST-41. It created the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council (FPISC), to provide a one-stop shop in the federal government and coordinate a single schedule for projects across permitting agencies. As stated in the Permitting Council's FY2020 Report to Congress:[19]

- The four voluntary, large-scale projects[20] that completed the federal permitting process in FY 2020 and that voluntarily applied for FAST-41 coverage represent an average of more than 10 years in time savings, 20,000 permanent and temporary jobs in construction, and more than $45 billion in economic investment.
- For one of these projects, Gemini Solar, the cost of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alone ($6.2 million), represented an estimated cost savings of $12.6 million from these time savings.
- The average completion time of an EIS between 2010 and 2018 was 4.5 years. Projects that voluntarily applied for FAST-41 and that completed the NEPA process during FY 2020 finalized an EIS in only 2.5 years – a 45 percent time reduction.
- For the Cardinal-Hickory Creek 345 kV Transmission Line Project, 50 percent of the federal reviews and authorizations were completed ahead of schedule and the NEPA process was completed in 3.3 years, or 27 percent faster than the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) average timeline for projects.

[19] Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council. *Annual Report to Congress*. Fiscal Year 2020. https://www.permits.performance.gov/sites/permits.dot.gov/files/2021-01/FY%202020%20FPISC%20Annual%20Report%20to%20Congress.pdf.

[20] The four projects are the Alaska LNG pipeline, Borderlands Wind, Cardinal-Hickory Creek Transmission Line, and Gemini Solar. Gemini Solar and Alaska LNG are some of the largest of their kind in the country.

Conclusion

Over the past decade, America has reduced its carbon emissions more than any other country. This was achieved through an all-of-the-above energy policy combined with public and private sector investments in American innovation. There is no need to reinvent this wheel.

Fortunately, the business case for climate solutions also illustrates the best business practices for climate solutions. Future climate policy, including modernizing the transportation sector to further reduce U.S. emissions, can build upon our past success by harnessing instead of hampering the power of free markets; maintaining American leadership through strategic R&D and infrastructure investments, and prioritizing reforms to reduce or eliminate regulatory barriers—particularly those that inhibit infrastructure development, domestic manufacturing, and American jobs.