

Webisode 57DHYAFZR January 12 2026 EPA to stop considering lives saved when setting PM 2 point 5 limits

Cartoon 1 of 8 EPA to Stop Considering Lives Saved When Setting Rules on Air Pollution! Cell 1 In a reversal the agency plans to calculate only the cost to industry! Cell 2 when setting pollution limits and not the monetary value of saving human lives documents show! Cell 3 The change could make it easier to repeal limits on pollutants from coal-burning power plants and oil refineries! Cell 4 steel mills and wood burning industrial power plants!

Cartoon 2 of 8 For decades the Environmental Protection Agency has calculated the health benefits of reducing air pollution! Cell 1 using the cost estimates of avoided asthma attacks and premature deaths to justify clean-air rules! Cell 2 In the current Administration the EPA plans to stop tallying gains from the health benefits! Cell 3 caused by curbing two of the most widespread deadly air pollutants fine particulate matter! Cell 4 and ozone when regulating industry according to internal agency emails and documents!

Cartoon 3 of 8 It is a seismic shift that runs counter to the EPA mission statement! Cell 1 which says the agency core responsibility is to protect human health and the environment! Cell 2 The change could make it easier to repeal limits on these pollutants from industrial facilities including wood burning industries across the country! Cell 3 That would most likely lower costs for companies while resulting in dirtier air! Cell 4 Fine particulate matter or PM2 point 5 refers to particles small enough to penetrate deep into the lungs and enter the bloodstream!

Cartoon 4 of 8 Long-term exposure to both pollutants is linked to asthma heart and lung disease and premature death! Cell 1 Even moderate exposure to PM2 point 5 can damage the lungs about as much as smoking! Under the Biden administration the EPA tightened the amount of PM2 point 5 that could be emitted by industrial facilities! Cell 3 It estimated that the rule would prevent up to 4500 premature deaths and 290000 lost workdays in 2032 alone! Cell 4 For every 1 dollar spent on reducing PM2 point 5 the agency said there could be as much as 77 dollars in health benefits!

Cartoon 5 of 8 But the Trump administration contends that these estimates are doubtful! Cell 1 and said the EPA would no longer take health effects into account Cell 2 in the cost-benefit analyses necessary for clean-air regulations! Cell 3 Instead the agency would estimate only the costs to businesses of complying with the rules! Cell 4 For 40 years Republican and Democratic administrations have used estimates of the monetary value of a human life in cost-benefit analyses! But until now no administration has counted it as zero!

Cartoon 6 of 8 One EPA Employee in the Current Administration Cell 1 The head of the EPA air and radiation office said that he had a personal stake in clean-air rules because he suffers from cystic fibrosis! Cell 2; He is a former registered lobbyist for the oil and chemical industries! Cell 3 His clients at his lobbyist firm included the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers! Cell 4 a trade association for oil refiners that has opposed stricter PM point 5 standards!

Cartoon 7 of 8 Cell 1 The Trump administration has taken other smaller steps to overhaul the cost-benefit analyses underpinning environmental rules! Cell 2 In May the White House ordered agencies to stop considering the economic damage caused by climate change! Cell 3 when crafting regulations

except in cases where it is plainly required by law! Cell 4 That directive effectively shelved a powerful tool known as the social cost of carbon that the Biden administration had used to strengthen limits on carbon emissions from cars and power plants!

Cartoon 8 of 8 Longstanding criticism from business groups argues that the government gives too much weight to the benefits of reducing PM2 point 5! Cell 1 when setting limits on other pollutants like mercury and lead! Cell 2 Technology that captures mercury and lead from power plant smokestacks would also reduce PM2 point 5 emissions! Cell 3 The EPA new approach is likely to draw legal challenges and could make rollbacks of pollution limits more vulnerable in court legal experts said! Cell 4 The move appeared to ignore the 2015 Supreme Court case Michigan versus EPA! In the majority opinion Justice Scalia wrote that if an agency considers the benefits of a regulation it must also consider the costs and vice versa!