

November 3, 2025

**Submitted via regulations.gov**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
EPA Docket Center  
Air and Radiation Docket  
Mailcode 28221T  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20460

**Re: Reconsideration of the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP)  
Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0186**

Dear Sir or Madam:

GPA Midstream Association (“GPA Midstream”) appreciates this opportunity to submit comments on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (“EPA”) proposed rulemaking, 90 Fed. Reg. 445591 (September 16, 2025) (the “Proposed Rule”) regarding reconsideration of the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP).

GPA Midstream has served the U.S. energy industry since 1921 and is composed of approximately 50 corporate members that directly employ 57,000 employees in a wide variety of services that move vital energy products such as natural gas, natural gas liquids, crude oil and refined products, commonly referred to as “midstream activities.” The work of our members indirectly creates or impacts more than 450,000 jobs across the U.S. economy. In 2024, GPA Midstream members operated more than 500,000 miles of pipelines, gathered nearly 91 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas, and operated more than 340 natural gas processing facilities that delivered pipeline quality gas into markets across a majority of the U.S. interstate and intrastate pipeline systems.

Sincerely,



Andrew Mooney  
Director of Federal Affairs  
GPA Midstream Association

**GPA Midstream Comments on GHGRP Reconsideration Proposal**

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Subpart W Reconsideration Rulemaking .....	3
EPA should proceed expeditiously to revise subpart W .....	3
Stationary Fuel Combustion Emissions .....	4
GPA Midstream has long advocated for removing stationary fuel combustion emissions from subpart W .....	4
Regardless of the fate of subpart C, stationary fuel combustion emissions should not be reported under subpart W .....	6
Stationary fuel combustion emissions are not “waste emissions” .....	6
The issue of whether subpart C should be required for subpart W reporters cannot be properly assessed independently of the Waste Emissions Charge rule.....	6
Retaining GHG Emissions Estimation Methodologies Option .....	7
45Q and 45V.....	8
Conclusion.....	9

## Introduction

GPA Midstream appreciates EPA's recent efforts to unleash American energy, such as publication of Interim Final Rule ("IFR") for Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review: Extension of Deadlines in Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources, 90 Fed. Reg. 35966 (Jul. 31, 2025). Furthermore, we appreciate the opportunity to participate in this rulemaking for the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP). After thoughtful consideration, GPA Midstream respectfully submits these comments in response to EPA's proposal to delay subpart W reporting until 2034, and to otherwise rescind the GHGRP.

GPA Midstream has participated in every GHGRP rulemaking for our industry, going back to creation of the inventory program in 2009, and spanning multiple administrations. GPA Midstream member companies report under numerous GHGRP subparts<sup>1</sup> for our facilities and are thus significantly affected by GHGRP rulemakings. GPA Midstream has consistently provided fact-based information to help inform rulemakings, and this continues to be our objective.

## Subpart W Reconsideration Rulemaking

### EPA should proceed expeditiously to revise subpart W

GPA Midstream is committed to continuing our engagement during the upcoming subpart W reconsideration rulemaking. Some member companies will continue their existing GHGRP-based data collection, calculation and reporting programs even in the absence of a requirement to report under GHGRP to (1) support progress toward publicly stated emissions reduction goals (2) ensure business continuity in anticipation of the 2034 subpart W reporting requirements (3) assess emissions compared to the waste emissions charge ("WEC") thresholds and (4) ensure access to international markets that require GHG emissions determinations and reporting. For these reasons, the subpart W reconsideration rulemaking is important to GPA Midstream, and we encourage EPA to proceed quickly with the rulemaking.

GPA Midstream submitted a petition for reconsideration on the final subpart W rule<sup>2</sup>, and we submitted a supplemental letter consolidating information previously provided to EPA

---

<sup>1</sup> Including subparts C, D, P, W, Y, MM, NN, PP, and UU.

<sup>2</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, *Petition for Reconsideration and Request for Partial Administrative Stay of EPA's Final Rule: "Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems*, 89 Fed. Reg. 42,062 (May 14, 2024), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234 (Jul. 12, 2024) ("GPA Midstream Association Petition for Reconsideration of Final WEC Rule").

during the 2022-2024 subpart W rulemaking process along with new information.<sup>3</sup> In those materials, GPA Midstream identified areas of subpart W that should be reconsidered to result in more correct assessment of emissions. We also identified ways to significantly streamline the data collection, calculation, and reporting requirements. GPA Midstream is committed to working with EPA to expeditiously revise subpart W along with updated reporting forms.

## Stationary Fuel Combustion Emissions

### GPA Midstream has long advocated for removing stationary fuel combustion emissions from subpart W

GPA Midstream strongly believes that stationary fuel combustion emissions for petroleum and natural gas systems should not be reported under subpart W. Every other industry has reported its combustion emissions under subpart C (addressing General Stationary Fuel Combustion Sources), while these emission sources in the petroleum and natural gas industry has been arbitrarily split between subparts C and W. This has never made good sense, and GPA Midstream has commented on this issue for over 10 years.

GPA Midstream commented on this issue when subpart W was first introduced. In our February 24, 2015 comment letter on the proposed subpart W,<sup>4</sup> we said “Since 2011, EPA has required owners and operators of boosting stations with emissions exceeding 25,000 mt CO<sub>2</sub>e to calculate and report combustion emissions using methods listed in subpart C of this part. Many owners and operators who would be required to report under the new ONGGB [Oil and Natural Gas Gathering and Boosting] industry segment have already been reporting combustion emissions, for sites in the same industry segment, under subpart C of this part. Requiring these same reporters to now use a different calculation methodology sets an unfair precedent, and imposes additional reporting burdens by deviating from previously accepted compliance methods. GPA Midstream suggests that the existing combustion calculation methodology used in subpart C is sufficiently accurate for future use at all booster stations.”

On May 18, 2016, GPA Midstream submitted a letter to EPA as a follow up to our January 21, 2016 meeting. In the letter, we requested that combustion emissions be reported under subpart C, “Our primary request is that EPA modify the rule language to allow use of

---

<sup>3</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, *Reconsideration of EPA’s Final Rule: “Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems*, 89 Fed. Reg. 42,062 (May 14, 2024), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234 (Aug. 29, 2025).

<sup>4</sup> Gas Processors Association, *Comments on EPA’s Proposed Rule, “Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2015 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems*,” 79 Fed. Reg. 73,148 (Dec. 9, 2014), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0831 (Feb. 24, 2015), at p. 25.

subpart C (including subpart C reporting requirements) for gathering and boosting facilities, which is the method by which combustion emissions have been determined for these facilities and reported to the EPA since 2010.”<sup>5</sup>

We brought up this issue again in our April 30, 2019 meeting with EPA on potential revisions to subpart W, and we submitted a follow-up letter requesting that subpart C be allowed to estimate and report combustion emissions.<sup>6</sup>

We also commented on this issue in our October 6, 2022 comments on the proposed subpart W rule: “The elaborate structure dividing reporting requirements for similar type sources and processes among subparts C and W has long been a source of confusion, administrative difficulty, and cost for affected facilities. For reporting consistency and to improve transparency, GPA Midstream requests that EPA consolidate combustion source calculation and reporting (40 C.F.R. §§ 98.233(z) and 98.236(z)) for all Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems segments under subpart C – General Stationary Fuel Combustion Sources.”<sup>7</sup> We again commented on this issue our October 2, 2023 comments on the re-proposed subpart W.<sup>8</sup>

We commented on this issue in our January 18, 2023 response to EPA’s request for information titled “Methane Emissions Reduction Program,”<sup>9</sup> and in our March 26, 2024 comments on the proposed “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems” rule.<sup>10</sup>

For the reasons stated over the past 10 years, stationary fuel combustion source emissions should not be reported under subpart W.

---

<sup>5</sup> GPA Midstream response to EPA questions during meeting on March 23, 2016 (May 18, 2016), available at <https://www.regulations.gov/docket/EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234>

<sup>6</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, Additional Information on Suggested Part 98, Subpart W Rule Revisions to Reduce Burden, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234-0096 (Sept. 13, 2019), available at <https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234-0096>.

<sup>7</sup> See GPA, Comments on EPA’s Proposed Rulemaking “Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Data Elements Under the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule”, Doc. ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0424-0192 (Oct. 6, 2022), at p. 25.

<sup>8</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, Comments on EPA’s Proposed Rule, “Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: Revisions and Confidentiality Determination for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems,” 88 Fed. Reg. 50,282 (Aug. 1, 2023), Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0234 (Oct. 2, 2023) at p. 49. (“GPA Midstream Association Comments on 2023 Proposed Subpart W Rule”).

<sup>9</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, Response to Request for Information, “Methane Emissions Reduction Program,” Docket ID Nos. EPA-HQ-OAR-2022-0875, EPA-HQ-OAR-2022-0875-0002, (Jan. 18, 2023) at p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> See GPA Midstream Association, *Comments of GPA Midstream Association on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Proposed Rule “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems,”* 89 Fed. Reg. 5318 (Jan. 26, 2024); Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0434 (Mar. 26, 2024) at p. 4.

## Regardless of the fate of subpart C, stationary fuel combustion emissions should not be reported under subpart W

Regardless of whether subpart C is retained in the GHGRP for all reporters, or just for subpart W reporters, or if subpart C is eliminated entirely, stationary fuel combustion emissions should not be reported under subpart W.

In the case that subpart C requirements are removed, but the stationary fuel combustion emissions reporting requirements are not removed from subpart W, it would be arbitrary and capricious for some oil and gas facilities to continue to report stationary fuel combustion emissions while other oil and gas facilities would not be required to do so.

## Stationary fuel combustion emissions are not “waste emissions”

If EPA does not remove stationary fuel combustion emissions reporting from subpart W, GPA Midstream recommends that EPA at this time clarify that natural gas used for stationary combustion is a beneficial use, and the emissions resulting from beneficial use of natural gas is not subject to the future waste emissions charge. While GPA Midstream still strongly believes these emissions should not be reported under subpart W, this clarification would mitigate at least some of our concerns regarding the cross-section of where these emissions are reported and how that impacts the waste emissions charge.

## The issue of whether subpart C should be required for subpart W reporters cannot be properly assessed independently of the Waste Emissions Charge rule

EPA proposes to eliminate reporting under subpart C and states, “If this rule is finalized as proposed, a large fraction of subpart W facilities that report under subpart C... would likely fall below the 25,000 metric ton CO<sub>2</sub>e threshold for subpart W and would eventually discontinue reporting under the program.” EPA also says, “Alternatively, the EPA is considering and taking comment on a modification to the requirements of subpart C that would limit the applicability of subpart C to subpart W (Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems) facilities over the same reporting years that would be applicable to subpart W facilities (i.e., suspended until RY2034 and future years).”

As GPA Midstream indicated during the 2024 WEC implementing rulemaking<sup>11,12</sup> and the 2024 subpart W rulemaking,<sup>13</sup> the WEC implementing rule and GHGRP are inextricably linked. Because the 2024 WEC implementing rule was rescinded through the Congressional Review Act, a new WEC implementing rule will need to be crafted. When rewritten, the WEC implementing rule and the GHGRP (along with 40 C.F.R. Part 60, subparts OOOOb and OOOOc (“OOOOOb/c”)) must be crafted and adjusted together to ensure they are aligned. Indeed, section 136(h), which directs EPA to undergo a rulemaking to revise subpart W, references *both* “the reporting under [subpart W], *and calculation of charges under subsections (e) and (f).*”<sup>14</sup> As EPA notes, reporting under subpart W is impacted by reporting requirements under subpart C. Separating the rulemaking on reporting from the rulemaking on the implementation of the waste emissions charge creates an artificial barrier that Congress did not intend. For example, it is not clear how EPA’s proposal, which would eliminate some facilities that are required to report under GHGRP (because their emissions would fall below the reporting threshold) impacts GPA Midstream members without knowing how the netting provisions of CAA § 136(f)(4) will be implemented.

As such, GPA Midstream requests that this issue should be addressed (or revisited) during WEC implementing rulemaking. More broadly, during the WEC implementing rulemaking, the GHGRP should be concurrently open for comment and revision to ensure rule alignment.

## Retaining GHG Emissions Estimation Methodologies

The GHGRP is a well-established framework, supported by over 15 years of data and widely recognized calculation methodologies. Should the EPA decide to suspend data collection under this program, it is essential that both the historical data and the associated methodologies remain accessible to the public.

---

<sup>11</sup> GPA Midstream Association, Comments of GPA Midstream Association on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Proposed Rule “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems,” 89 Fed. Reg. 5318 (Jan. 26, 2024); Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2023–0434 at 2 (“EPA should acknowledge that the incomplete status of various related rulemaking proceedings impedes the public’s ability to comment on this Proposed Rule. EPA must engage in additional rulemaking to clarify aspects of the Proposed Rule, as described in these comments, and engage in additional rulemaking to coordinate the requirements of the proposed WEC with Subpart W and NSPS OOOOb/EG OOOOc.”).

<sup>12</sup> GPA Midstream Association Petition for Reconsideration of Final WEC Rule at 14. (“This Final Rule is the third piece in a set of intertwined regulations: OOOOb/c, Subpart W, and the WEC. All three final rules need revisions to ensure the rules are harmonized...”).

<sup>13</sup> GPA Midstream Association Comments on 2023 Proposed Subpart W Rule at 3.

<sup>14</sup> CAA § 136(h), 42 U.S.C. § 7436(h) (emphasis added).

In the absence of the GHGRP, GPA Midstream anticipates that various state and voluntary initiatives may attempt to fill the reporting void. This could lead to a fragmented landscape of inconsistent protocols, ultimately increasing the regulatory burden and operational costs for industry participants.

To mitigate this risk, the calculation methodologies outlined in 40 CFR Part 98 should be preserved as a reference for operators who wish to continue quantifying and reporting their greenhouse gas emissions. While historical versions of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) are available electronically, GPA Midstream recommends relocating these methodologies to a more centralized and enduring resource, such as the EPA's Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors from Stationary Sources (AP-42)<sup>15</sup>. This transition would simplify the process of updating existing citations and references to the GHGRP, ensuring continuity and ease of access.

Moreover, such a move would help preempt the emergence of ad-hoc, overly complex protocols, promoting consistency across reporting frameworks and reducing unnecessary burdens on operators.

## 45Q and 45V

Regulatory certainty is critical to ensuring investment and unleashing American energy. GPA Midstream has reviewed EPA's belief that the Agency is not required to provide GHGRP data for regulations under Sections 45Q – Credit for Carbon Oxide Sequestration and Section 45V – Credit for Clean Hydrogen Production of the Internal Revenue Code. After careful inspection, we offer the following observations and recommendation for EPA's consideration.

Section 45Q credit reporting structure is integrated with the GHGRP in a multitude of ways, such that wholesale removal will leave significant gaps in statutory, regulatory, and administrative guidance related to qualification and reporting of 45Q credits. IRS Form 8933, used for claiming 45Q credits, specifically requires information which is covered under parts of the GHGRP.

If the GHGRP is discontinued, GPA Midstream recommends that EPA leverage its extensive resource base and knowledge of GHG accounting to serve in an advisory capacity to the IRS or other government agency implementing these programs, ensuring accurate implementation and reporting structures. However, as stated above, GPA Midstream believes retaining the calculation methodologies that have already been established in the

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/ap-42-compilation-air-emissions-factors-stationary-sources>



GHGRP in an EPA managed document like AP-42 would provide the best starting point to retaining the calculations needed for these rules.

## Conclusion

GPA Midstream appreciates the continued opportunity to work with the agency on rules that reduce and accurately represent methane emissions in a technically feasible and cost-effective manner. GPA Midstream hopes to continue to work collaboratively with EPA to update subpart W through the reconsideration rulemaking. If EPA moves forward with repealing the remaining parts of the GHGRP, GPA Midstream hopes to work with EPA to maintain the historical knowledge and expertise that has made the United States a leader in emissions measurements, quantification and reductions.