

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Snowmobiles: Environmental Standards and Access to National Parks

Updated July 16, 2004

James E. McCarthy
Specialist in Environmental Policy
Resources, Science, and Industry Division

Snowmobiles: Environmental Standards and Access to National Parks

Summary

On June 17, 2004, the House voted 224-198 against an amendment to the Interior Department's FY2005 appropriation bill (H.Amdt. 563 to H.R. 4568) that would have prohibited recreational snowmobiling in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. This was the second time the House had voted on the issue in this Congress: on a tie vote, July 17, 2003, the House did not approve an amendment to the FY2004 Interior Appropriations bill (H.Amdt. 266 to H.R. 2691) that would have implemented a similar ban. The use of snowmobiles in national parks has been controversial because of their potential impacts on wildlife and because of the absence of standards for their emissions and noise. This report focuses on the latter set of issues.

Most current model snowmobiles emit significant quantities of pollution. In one hour, a typical snowmobile emits as much hydrocarbon as a 2001 model auto emits in about two years (24,300 miles) of driving. On November 8, 2002, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated regulations limiting air emissions from snowmobiles. These regulations would require a 30% reduction in emissions beginning in 2006, with more stringent standards (requiring 50% reductions) effective in 2010 and 2012. The standards were challenged in court by both the snowmobile manufacturers and environmental groups and were vacated in part and remanded to EPA in part by the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, June 1, 2004. EPA has not promulgated any standards for snowmobile noise.

Regarding national parks, the National Park Service has allowed snowmobile use in 44 units of the park system, in many cases in apparent violation of Executive Orders from the Nixon and Carter years. Outside of Alaska (where snowmobiles are permitted in most national parks by law), the most popular national park for snowmobiling has been Yellowstone, which saw more than 76,000 snowmobile visits in the 1999-2000 winter season. Under the Clinton Administration, the National Park Service decided that the emissions and noise from snowmobiling were incompatible with protecting the park, and promulgated rules that would have banned snowmobiles from Yellowstone beginning in the winter of 2003-2004. The Bush Administration revisited these rules in settlement of a lawsuit, and announced modifications in March 2003. The modifications would allow 950 cleaner and quieter snowmobiles to enter Yellowstone Park per day. These rules and the Clinton Administration ban have been the subject of conflicting court rulings: a federal court in Wyoming has issued a Temporary Restraining Order against implementation of the Clinton Administration's phaseout, while a federal court in the District of Columbia has vacated and remanded the Bush Administration rules.

Efforts to reduce snowmobile emissions and noise remain contentious. This report discusses snowmobile access to the parks, snowmobile emissions, and the new EPA standards, and concludes with a discussion of legislative proposals in the 107th and 108th Congresses. It will be updated as events warrant.

Contents

Snowmobile Use in National Parks	1
Park Service Policy on Snowmobile Access	2
Denali National Park	3
Yellowstone/Grand Teton	4
Clean Air Act and Noise Control Act Regulation	6
Snowmobile Emissions	6
EPA's New Regulations	8
Reaction to the EPA Standards	11
Legislative Issues	13
Conclusions	14

List of Tables

Table 1. National Park Use by Snowmobiles, Winter 1999-2000	2
Table 2. EPA and NPS Snowmobile Emission Limits	9

Snowmobiles: Environmental Standards and Access to National Parks

Proposals by the National Park Service to enforce long-standing policy that regulates the use of snowmobiles in national parks have raised a number of questions regarding the current and potential regulation of such vehicles. National Park System units account for only about 3% of the land mass of the United States and possess few trails and roads suitable for snowmobiles, compared to areas available on other federal lands; but — for both proponents and opponents — the question of snowmobile access to the parks has taken on a far greater importance. To the snowmobile industry and to many in communities neighboring national parks, “Snowmobiling is an important part of the economic engine that supports northern communities, winter tourism.”¹ To environmental groups, snowmobiling “is one of the most environmentally devastating recreational activities permitted by the Park Service resulting in adverse impacts to Park wildlife, air and water quality, vegetation, Park ecology, and Park users.”² Underlying the debate are broader questions concerning regulation of emissions and noise from the vehicles and the degree to which restrictions may serve as a precedent or stigma affecting snowmobile and motorized recreation³ use more generally.

Snowmobile Use in National Parks

In recent years, snowmobiles have been allowed access to 44 units of the National Park System, including such major parks as Yellowstone, Grand Teton, Rocky Mountain, Acadia, Zion, Mount Rainier, and Sequoia. While numerous park units have allowed such access, recreational use of snowmobiles is not widespread in the park system as a whole. The National Park Service (NPS) administers 388 units (parks, seashores, monuments, etc.). Of these, 344 (89%) have not been open to snowmobiles. Many units are located in climates unsuitable for them or are too small to be used for such recreation. Others (e.g., Glacier National Park and Yosemite) have banned snowmobiles since the 1970s. According to the National Park Service, use of snowmobiles outside of Alaska is mostly concentrated in five

¹ Statement of Ed Klim, President, International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association, at U.S. EPA Public Hearing, Washington, D.C., October 24, 2001.

² Petition to Prohibit Snowmobiling and Road Grooming in National Parks, submitted to the National Park Service, January 21, 1999, by Bluewater Network and 60 other environmental groups. A copy of the petition is attached to the testimony of Sean Smith, Public Lands Director, Bluewater Network, submitted to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, May 25, 2000.

³ Motorized recreation includes all-terrain vehicles, off-road motorcycles, and personal water craft, in addition to snowmobiles.

units of the park system: Yellowstone National Park, Voyageurs National Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and the John D. Rockefeller Memorial Parkway (see **Table 1**).

Table 1. National Park Use by Snowmobiles, Winter 1999-2000

Park Service Unit	Location	Number of Snowmobiles Entering the Park
Yellowstone National Park	Wyoming	76,571
Voyageurs National Park	Minnesota	35,000
Rocky Mountain National Park	Colorado	27,000
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore	Michigan	26,000
John D. Rockefeller Memorial Parkway	Wyoming	23,399

Sources: National Park Service, National Parks Conservation Association.

Park Service Policy on Snowmobile Access

Although recreational access by snowmobiles has been permitted in these units of the park system, the Park Service in recent years has concluded that such use has generally been in violation of Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, issued by Presidents Nixon and Carter respectively. The Nixon Order directed that use of off-road vehicles on public lands “be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands.”⁴ It specified that off-road vehicle “areas and trails shall be located in areas of the National Park system ... only if the respective agency head determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect their natural, aesthetic, or scenic values,” and it directed the Park Service to “monitor the effects of the use of off-road vehicles” and to rescind or limit this use “as necessary to further the policy of this order.”

In January 1999, the Park Service received a rulemaking petition from the Bluewater Network and 60 other environmental organizations seeking a ban on snowmobiles from all units of the National Park Service. In response, the Service surveyed units of the System to assess the extent to which they were complying with the Executive Orders. According to Interior Department testimony: “The results graphically demonstrated that the National Park Service was not complying with its statutory and regulatory mandates.... Consequently, maintaining the status quo with regard to snowmobiling was simply not an option.”⁵ On April 27, 2000, the

⁴Executive Order 11644, “Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands,” 37 Federal Register 2877, February 9, 1972.

⁵ Statement of Donald J. Barry, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, U.S. (continued...)

Department of the Interior and the National Park Service announced that “snowmobiling for general recreational purposes will be prohibited throughout the Park System, with a limited number of narrow exceptions.”⁶ By July 2000, the Department had backed away from its strict enforcement stance with a clarification: there would be no snowmobile ban in park units pending a formal rulemaking and public comment period, and snowmobile practices prior to the April 2000 announcement (i.e., access to more than 40 parks) would continue in place through the 2000-2001 winter season.⁷ NPS has taken no further action to enunciate a general policy.

Since the summer of 2000, the focus has been on Denali National Park in Alaska and the Yellowstone/Grand Teton area. Both of these areas had been considered exceptions subject to special consideration even under the April 2000 policy announced by the Park Service. Whether snowmobile access to these parks will be allowed to continue has generated substantial public interest.

Denali National Park. In Alaska, vast distances, lack of roads, abundant snow cover, and small dispersed populations make snow machine use ubiquitous. In general, national parks in Alaska allow snowmobile access under the provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA, P.L. 96-487). However, access to the 2 million acres formerly known as Mt. McKinley National Park (now the core of Denali National Park) has been an issue. Prior to passage of ANILCA (1980), snowmobiles had been banned from this park. In 1999, the Park Service reinstated this policy, banning snowmobiles first on a temporary and later on a permanent basis.⁸ Litigation regarding access to Denali was initiated by snowmobile user groups, but was withdrawn in June 2001, on the assumption that legislation would be introduced to address the issue. Legislation (H.R. 4677 / S. 2589, 107th Congress) was introduced in the spring of 2002 that would have allowed access to some portions of the old Park, while continuing the ban elsewhere. No action was taken on these bills, however, and as of July 2004, similar legislation has not been introduced in the 108th Congress.

⁵(...continued)

Department of the Interior, before the House Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, May 25, 2000.

⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Assistant Secretary, “National Park Service Puts the Brakes on Escalating Snowmobile Use in the National Park System,” Press Release, April 27, 2000, p. 2. In addition to Alaska parks and the three Yellowstone area units discussed below, Voyageurs National Park in Minnesota was also exempted because of the express authorization of snowmobiles in its enabling legislation.

⁷ Statement of Denis P. Galvin, Deputy Director, National Park Service before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, House Committee on Resources, Oversight Hearing on General Issues Involving Access to National Parks, July 20, 2000, p. 2.

⁸ The temporary closure was instituted on February 3, 1999. The permanent closure was finalized June 19, 2000, at 65 Federal Register 37863.

Yellowstone/Grand Teton. The other exception to the National Park Service's general policy was the Yellowstone/Grand Teton National Park area. The NPS had been sued in May 1997 by groups who alleged that the Service was violating the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Park Service Organic Act, and the Yellowstone Act in allowing use of snowmobiles in the two parks and on the Rockefeller Memorial Parkway (which links them). The lawsuit was settled within months when the NPS agreed to conduct an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) of winter use of the parks. Upon completion of the study, the Clinton Administration promulgated a final rule in January 2001, banning snowmobiles from Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and the Rockefeller Parkway beginning in the winter of 2003-2004, but allowing continued visitor access through the use of "snowcoaches" — guided tour-vans that run on rubber treads.⁹

Snowmobile manufacturers, represented by the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association (ISMA), have suggested that "cleaner, quieter" snowmobiles — a phrase not initially defined — be allowed continued access to the parks. Their suggestion found a receptive audience in the Bush Administration. On June 29, 2001, the Administration responded to a suit filed by ISMA and the State of Wyoming by agreeing to reopen the decision to ban the vehicles from the three Yellowstone area units. The Park Service agreed to prepare a Supplemental EIS and reach a new Record of Decision by November 15, 2002 (a deadline subsequently extended to March 15, 2003).

The Record of Decision was signed March 25, 2003, and a final rule implementing it was promulgated December 11, 2003.¹⁰ Despite receiving 104,802 comments on the final proposal, 91% of which "believed the proposed regulation does not adequately protect park resources due to the presence of snowmobiles,"¹¹ the Park Service reversed the ban in favor of daily limits on entrants, emission standards for the snowmobiles, other access requirements, and an "adaptive management strategy," allowing park managers to take remedial action if monitoring indicates unacceptable impacts from implementation. In explaining its position, the NPS stated: "We are trying to provide a range of appropriate activities in the parks, while protecting park resources and values."¹²

The new rule would set a daily limit of 950 snowmobile entrance passes for Yellowstone Park, 115 in Grand Teton National Park, and 400 on Rockefeller Memorial Parkway.¹³ On most days, this limit would result in no reduction of snowmobile users; but on weekends and holidays, when as many as 1,700 snowmobiles now enter the three park units, it could limit the number of entrants.

⁹ Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, 66 Federal Register 7260, January 22, 2001.

¹⁰ Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, 68 Federal Register 69268, December 11, 2003.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69269.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Seventy-five of the passes are for the Continental Divide Snowmobile Trail, which lies in both Grand Teton National Park and the Parkway. These are counted in each unit's total.

Snowmobile users would generally be required to be accompanied by trained guides (although the regulations would allow group members to be as much as 1/3 of a mile from the guide, and the rule preamble concedes, given the noise of a snowmobile, that communication is difficult if not impossible even between passengers on the same machine). To discourage irresponsible behavior, alcohol use by snowmobile users would be strictly limited.

The machines themselves would be required to achieve a 90% reduction in hydrocarbon emissions and a 70% reduction in carbon monoxide under the Bush Administration rules. Noise emissions would be limited to 73 dB(A), which the NPS estimates is about a 50% reduction compared to conventional snowmobiles. To implement these provisions, the Yellowstone Park Superintendent released a list of 10 snowmobile models approved for use during the 2003-2004 winter season, on September 16, 2003.¹⁴

A hearing on the new rules was held in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on December 15. The rules were vacated and remanded to the National Park Service by Judge Emmett Sullivan on December 16. The judge held that there was no evidence in the record to support the Bush Administration reversal of the previous agency position and that the decision, therefore, was “arbitrary and capricious.” The court also held that the Supplemental EIS accompanying the changes was “flatly inadequate” under NEPA and that the snowmobile decision was “completely politically driven and result oriented.”¹⁵ The judge also ordered NPS to respond to Bluewater Network’s 1999 rulemaking petition (seeking a ban on snowmobiles in all National Park System units) by February 17, 2004.¹⁶ Judge Sullivan’s decision reinstated the Clinton Administration rule and cut the number of snowmobiles entering the three Yellowstone area park units in half for the 2003-2004 winter season in preparation for a complete ban in 2004-5.

Both ISMA and the State of Wyoming appealed the court’s ruling. Their request for a stay of the Clinton-era rules pending resolution of their appeal was denied by Judge Sullivan in late December and by a three-judge panel of the Court of Appeals January 13, 2004. Meanwhile, however, the same groups petitioned the Federal District Court for Wyoming to overturn the Clinton-era rules. That court

¹⁴ [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/press/03115.htm>].

¹⁵ *Fund for Animals v. Norton*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22557 (D. D.C. December 16, 2003).

¹⁶ NPS denied the petition February 17, 2004, stating that given the differences among parks, “a service-wide directive to prohibit all forms of recreational snowmobile use in the National Park System is no longer warranted and ... with requirements for monitoring and increased use of newer technology snowmobiles, recreational uses can continue to be a part of the NPS winter experience. This will allow decisions to be made on a park-by-park basis, relying on the professional judgment of each park’s staff. They will be able to consider the lessons from Yellowstone, such as the use of Best Available Technology requirements, guiding requirements, and adaptive management, as well as overall technological improvements and any other new information, and will then be able to determine whether any review or revision of their special regulations is needed.” See “Snowmobile Use in the National Park System,” Memorandum from Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks to the Director, National Park Service, February 17, 2004, pp. 4-5.

responded February 10, 2004, when Judge Clarence Brimmer issued a temporary restraining order against the Clinton rules and ordered the National Park Service to develop temporary rules for the remainder of the 2004 winter season. On February 11, the Park Service issued such rules, allowing 780 snowmobiles to enter Yellowstone Park each day, an increase of 287 machines. Grand Teton Park and the Rockefeller Parkway were allowed 140 snowmobiles, an increase of 90.¹⁷ An appeal of Judge Brimmer's order was denied by the 10th Circuit Court in Denver on March 10. On June 2, the National Park Service began additional studies to establish a Temporary Winter Use Plan for the 2004-2005 season.¹⁸ The Park Service anticipates completing an Environmental Assessment and proposed Winter Use Plan for public review by August 20, 2004, with final regulations published in time for the December 15 opening of the winter season. Judge Sullivan subsequently ordered NPS to complete this study by "a minimum of 30 days prior to the commencement of preparations — that is, trail grooming — for the winter use season."¹⁹ Further developments in both the Wyoming and D.C. cases are expected.

Legislation to resolve the Yellowstone / Grand Teton issue has also been introduced. It is discussed below in the "Legislative Issues" section.

Clean Air Act and Noise Control Act Regulation

In reversing the Clinton Administration rules on Yellowstone access, the National Park Service set limits on emissions and noise from the snowmobiles that would be allowed in the three Yellowstone area park units. Simultaneously, EPA has developed emission limits applicable to all new snowmobiles beginning in 2006. The following sections of this report describe the EPA proposals and look at the broader issue of snowmobile emissions.

The Clean Air Act gives EPA authority to regulate emissions from mobile sources of pollution, including off-road sources such as snowmobiles; but snowmobiles, until now, have not been subject to any federal or state emission regulations. Nor have they ever been subject to noise regulations. EPA has authority under Section 6 of the Noise Control Act of 1972 to regulate noise from "transportation equipment (including recreational vehicles and related equipment)." But the Agency's Office of Noise Abatement and Control was disbanded in 1982, and EPA has not issued any regulations under the statute in the 22 years since then.

Snowmobile Emissions

Snowmobiles generally run on two-stroke engines — the type of engine that traditionally has powered outboard motors and lawnmowers. In a two-stroke engine, fuel enters the combustion chamber at the same time that exhaust gases are expelled from it. As a result, as much as one-third of the fuel passes through the engine

¹⁷ For details of the February 11 rules, see Yellowstone National Park, Winter Use Status, at [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/planvisit/todo/winter/index.htm>].

¹⁸ See [<http://www.nps.gov/yell/press/0448.htm>].

¹⁹ *Fund for Animals v. Norton*, D.D.C., No. 02-2367, June 30, 2004.

without being combusted.²⁰ This causes poor fuel economy and high levels of emissions, particularly hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. In one hour, a typical snowmobile emits as much hydrocarbon as a 2001 model automobile emits in 24,300 miles of driving.²¹ In a day of use, a snowmobile may emit as much hydrocarbon as an automobile emits in 8-10 years of operation. Snowmobiles also emit as much carbon monoxide in an hour as a 2001 model auto does in 1,520 miles of driving. The impact of these emissions on ambient air quality (as described below) is of at least equal concern as that of hydrocarbons because of the tendency for atmospheric accumulation of CO in winter.

The hydrocarbons (gasoline) emitted by snowmobiles contain benzene, formaldehyde, and at least three other substances that are known or suspected human carcinogens. Carbon monoxide, on the other hand, is a poisonous gas that, at low levels, can affect those who suffer from cardiovascular disease, such as angina.

In preparing the 2000 Environmental Impact Statement for the decision on snowmobile access to Yellowstone, the National Park Service measured emissions from snowmobiles and compared them to other emission sources in the park. The Service also estimated the concentrations (ambient levels) of carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM) present in the air and compared these concentrations to air quality standards. The EIS concluded that the 8-hour maximum concentration of carbon monoxide at the West Yellowstone entrance to the park exceeded the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO by nearly 70% (a concentration of 15.15 parts per million vs. the standard of 9).²² The analysis also concluded that snowmobiles accounted for 97.9% of the CO at West Yellowstone during winter months.

Noise has also been an issue. Opponents of allowing snowmobiles in Yellowstone and other units of the national park system argue that the parks are special places whose remoteness, beauty, and quiet inspire reflection and awe. The noise of engines is incompatible with this atmosphere, they argue. Snowmobile enthusiasts counter that the parks cover vast areas and that snowmobiles are restricted to a few roads — the same roads traversed by cars, recreational vehicles, and buses in summer. They also assert that snowmobile use is compatible with the NPS responsibility to promote visitor use and enjoyment of park resources. Park Service studies indicate that the sound of snowmobiles can be heard for significantly greater distances than that of automobiles, however, and is essentially continuous during the

²⁰ In a four-stroke engine (used in automobiles and some newer outboard motors and lawn mowers, but not generally used in snowmobiles) the combustion chamber takes in fuel, compresses it, ignites it, and exhausts it in separate cycles, leading to far more complete combustion and lower emissions, even without the application of emission controls.

²¹ U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, *Draft Regulatory Support Document: Control of Emissions from Unregulated Nonroad Engines*, September 2001, p. I-25, available at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/proposal/cleanrec.htm#rsd>].

²² U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Winter Use Plans, Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway*, Volume 1, Chapter 4, p. 224, available at [<http://www.nps.gov/planning/yell/winterfinal/>]. Ambient air quality standards were not exceeded elsewhere in the park.

winter at key locations in Yellowstone: snowmobile noise can be heard 95% of the time by visitors at Old Faithful and 87% of the time at the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone.²³

EPA's New Regulations

Regulations for snowmobile and other non-road engine emissions were signed by EPA Administrator Whitman September 13, 2002 and appeared in the Federal Register November 8, 2002.²⁴ As shown in Table 2, the regulations would reduce both carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions from new snowmobiles a little more than 30% starting in 2006 and an average of 50% by 2012, with an intermediate step in 2010. (The regulations do not require any controls on snowmobiles sold before 2006.) For comparison, Table 2 also shows the Yellowstone-specific standards that would have been imposed by the National Park Service under the vacated Bush Administration winter use rule, beginning in 2003-4.

According to EPA, the 2006/2007 reductions can be achieved without major changes in technology, in part because they apply to the average of a manufacturer's fleet emissions, rather than to individual machines. This will allow manufacturers to provide a range of models, some with advanced emission controls and others without: "While some advanced technologies such as two-stroke direct injection and four-stroke engines, would be found in some models, many models would still be equipped with two-stroke engines with relatively minor engine modifications resulting in minimum emission reductions, while some models may not even have any emission controls."²⁵ EPA estimates the cost of these Phase 1 controls at \$73 per snowmobile. Vehicles meeting the standards will be more fuel-efficient, resulting in an average reduction in operating cost of \$57, thus offsetting most of the initial cost increase.

²³ National Park Service, Proposed Rule, Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, 65 Federal Register 79026, December 18, 2000.

²⁴ U.S.EPA, Control of Emissions from Nonroad Large Spark-Ignition Engines, and Recreational Engines (Marine and Land-Based), Final Rule, 67 Federal Register 68241, available at [<http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-AIR/2002/November/Day-08/a23801.htm>].

²⁵ Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: Control of Emissions from Nonroad Large Spark Ignition Engines and Recreational Engines (Marine and Land-based), Preamble, p. 134. Further discussion, including the cost estimates, is found on p. 171. The proposal was published at 66 Federal Register 51098, October 5, 2001, and is available on EPA's website at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/nonroad.htm>]. The preamble to the final standards says that one scenario for meeting the 2006/2007 standards would be 15% four-stroke engines, 15% direct injection two-strokes, 60% conventional two-strokes with improved carburetion, enleanment strategies, and engine modifications; presumably, the other 10% would have no modifications at all. Control of Emissions from Nonroad Large Spark-ignition Engines, and Recreational Engines (Marine and Land-based), Final Rule, as signed September 13, 2002, Preamble, p. 93, available at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/2002/preamble.pdf>].

Table 2. EPA and NPS Snowmobile Emission Limits

Year	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	% Reduction	Hydrocarbons (HC)	% Reduction
current average	397 g/kW-hr		150 g/kW-hr	
2006/2007*	275 g/kW-hr	30.7%	100 g/kW-hr	33.3%
2010	275 g/kW-hr	30.7%	75 g/kW-hr	50%
2012**	200 g/kW-hr*	49.6%	75 g/kW-hr*	50%
Yellowstone/ 2003 (NPS)	120 g/kW-hr	70%	15 g/kW-hr	90%

g/kW-hr = grams per kilowatt-hour.

* Half of snowmobiles sold in 2006 must comply with the EPA standards. With a few exceptions, all snowmobiles sold in 2007 must comply.

** EPA's 2012 standards allow manufacturers to trade additional reductions in HC for increases in CO emissions, provided that CO emissions are reduced at least 30%, HC emissions are reduced at least 50%, and the total of HC+CO emissions sums to 100%. Thus, for example, HC reductions of 60% and CO reductions of 40% would satisfy the requirement, as would HC reductions of 70% and CO reductions of 30%.

The 2010 and 2012 standards, which also are fleet averages, can also be met without eliminating two-stroke engines, according to the Agency. Because two-stroke engines produce more power than similar size four-strokes and are easy to start in cold weather, the Agency expects the industry to continue to manufacture mostly two-stroke engines even in 2012, although many would be modified with direct injection technology to reduce emissions. According to the Agency, "A potential scenario for meeting these standards could be a mixture of 50 percent direct injection, 20 percent four-stroke engines, and 30 percent with engine modifications."²⁶ The cost of these changes would average an additional \$131 per snowmobile in 2010, according to EPA, but the costs would be offset by \$286 in fuel savings and improved performance, so that lifetime costs would actually be \$155 lower. The same is true of the 2012 standards: the added cost of \$89 per snowmobile is offset by \$191 in fuel savings and improved performance, according to EPA, for a net savings of \$102 per vehicle.²⁷

The costs of each of the three phases are incremental. Thus, when fully implemented, the standards would cost an additional \$293 per snowmobile, according to the Agency; lifetime operating costs, however, would decline by \$534. Combining these two factors, the standards would decrease total costs by \$241 per snowmobile when fully implemented.

²⁶ Preamble to the Final Rule, *ibid.*, p. 94.

²⁷ See Preamble to the Final Rule, previously cited, Table IX.B-1, p. 179.

As compared to the standards EPA proposed in 2001, the final standards were weakened or made more flexible in three respects, and strengthened in two. First, the 2006 standards are to be phased in, with only 50% of 2006 model snowmobiles required to meet the standard, and full compliance delayed until the 2007 model year. Second, the 2010 standard for carbon monoxide remains at the 2006 level of 275 grams per kilowatt-hour; in EPA's original proposal, it would have been reduced to 200. Third, in 2012, manufacturers will have to meet the standards originally proposed for 2010, but, within limits, they will be allowed to trade reductions in CO for additional reductions in hydrocarbons. Thus, reductions of CO may not reach the 50% level originally proposed; if they don't, however, the extra CO emissions would be offset by additional reductions in hydrocarbons.

The standards were strengthened in two respects. First, EPA added a permeation emission standard for fuel tanks and hoses. Fuel evaporates through hoses and through the walls of plastic containers (such as those used as fuel tanks on snowmobiles). The tank and hose standards require an 85% reduction in plastic fuel tank permeation emissions and a 95% reduction in fuel system hose permeation beginning in 2008, in order to lower hydrocarbon emissions from evaporation. The cost of this standard is estimated at \$7 per vehicle, with cost savings of \$11.²⁸ The second, relatively minor, strengthening was the addition of a cap on emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) in 2012. The NOx cap was set at approximately the current level of emissions. It was added because some of the technologies that might be used to lower HC and CO could simultaneously increase NOx. To prevent that, the Agency added a cap at current levels.²⁹

The standards do not include noise limits. While acknowledging that the Agency has the authority to set noise standards, the proposal stated that "at this time we do not have funding to pursue noise standards for nonroad equipment that does not have an existing noise requirement."³⁰ An Agency source confirmed that the proposed standards would have essentially no impact on noise.³¹ Despite receiving comments from a number of organizations that the standards should address noise, the Agency restated in its response to public comments that it would not address the issue, adding that Congress would need to provide appropriations for the Agency to begin any noise control initiative.³² (As noted, the National Park Service promulgated noise standards applicable to snowmobiles entering its three Yellowstone area park units beginning December 17, 2003, under the winter use rule that has now been vacated. According to Park Service estimates, these standards would require a reduction of about 50% in noise emitted by the affected snowmobiles, compared to conventional uncontrolled snowmobiles.)

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 73.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 135.

³¹ Personal communication, John Mueller, U.S. EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality, September 28, 2001.

³² U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, *Summary and Analysis of Comments: Control of Emissions from Unregulated Nonroad Engines*, September 2002, p.II-78, available at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/2002/r02023.pdf>].

Reaction to the EPA Standards

Both the snowmobile industry and environmentalists have challenged EPA's standards in court. On June 1, 2004, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated the standard for nitrogen oxides and remanded the standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. The court directed EPA "to clarify (1) the statutory and evidentiary basis of the Agency's assumption that the standards must be sufficiently lenient to permit the continued production of all existing snowmobile models, and (2) the analysis and evidence underlying the Agency's conclusion that advanced technologies can be applied to no more than 70% of new snowmobiles by 2012."³³

The International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association (ISMA) has argued that EPA grossly underestimated the costs of compliance, and that the standards would lead to the elimination of entry-level snowmobiles from the market. Cleaner, quieter machines can be made, according to ISMA, but they cost more, are heavier, and can only be ridden on groomed roads. ISMA estimates that the cleanest four-stroke engines cost an additional \$1,700 (about 30% more than current average prices). Even modest improvements to two-stroke engines will cost \$350-\$400 per machine, according to the Association.³⁴

Bluewater Network, on the other hand — the environmental group most identified with snowmobile issues — feels the rules should be much stronger.³⁵ In comments submitted to EPA, Bluewater encouraged the Agency to set standards "that can only be met using the best available technology, which we believe to be four-stroke engines with particle traps and three-way catalysts."³⁶ They also want mandatory emission labels for the machines, and are disappointed that the Agency chose not to set noise standards.

Bluewater points to the Clean Snowmobile Challenge, an annual design contest open to college engineering students and sponsored by the Society of Automotive Engineers, as demonstrating that machines far cleaner than EPA's proposed standards are feasible. The winning entry in the 2001 Challenge reduced CO 78.8% and unburned hydrocarbons 97.6% and significantly reduced noise, at a cost of \$600.³⁷ "If college students are able to build cleaner and quieter machines, surely the billion-

³³ Bluewater Network v. EPA, D.D.C., No. 03-1003, June 1, 2004, p. 4.

³⁴ Personal communication, Ed Klim, President, ISMA, September 27, 2001.

³⁵ Personal communication, Sean Smith, Bluewater Network, September 27, 2001. Also see "Bush Administration Fails to Protect Public Health, Folds to Industry Interests," Press Release, September 13, 2002, available at [http://www.bluewaternet.org/press_releases/pr2002sep13_pl_eparule.pdf].

³⁶ Bluewater Network, "Comments on the Environmental Protection Agency's Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Docket A-2000-01," p. 2.

³⁷ See " 'Clean' Snowmobile Produces Lower Emissions than the Average Car at SAE Clean Snowmobile Challenge 2001," Press Release, April 10, 2001.

dollar snowmobile industry can do as well,” says Bluewater Public Land Director Sean Smith.³⁸

Both Bluewater and the snowmobile manufacturers argue that EPA has misinterpreted the legal authority on which the new standards rely. Bluewater (as well as other environmental groups and STAPPA, the association representing state air pollution program administrators) argues that EPA is promulgating standards that are less stringent than the law requires. Section 213(a)(3) of the Clean Air Act requires the Agency to promulgate standards that “achieve the greatest degree of emission reduction achievable ... giving appropriate consideration to the cost ... and to noise, energy, and safety factors....” Four-stroke engine technology, achieving greater emission reductions than the Agency proposed, is already available, they note — machines using this technology are on the market. Cost, noise, and energy factors cannot be used as arguments against adoption of this technology: the lifetime cost of such engines would be lower than that of current engines, according to the Agency’s own analysis; the technology uses far less energy, and could be substantially quieter than current engines. Thus, according to these groups, the Agency’s standards do not meet the requirements of the act.

Snowmobile and other nonroad-vehicle manufacturers, on the other hand, focus on Section 213(a)(2) of the act, which ties the Agency’s authority to regulate nonroad engines to a finding by the Administrator that emissions from such engines or vehicles “are significant contributors to ozone or carbon monoxide concentrations in more than 1 area which has failed to attain the national ambient air quality standards for ozone or carbon monoxide.” EPA addressed this issue before beginning the process of developing regulations: on June 17, 1994, the Agency made an affirmative determination that emissions from nonroad engines and vehicles are significant contributors to ozone, CO, and particulate matter in more than one nonattainment area.³⁹ On December 7, 2000, the Agency issued a finding that recreational vehicles (including snowmobiles) are among the specific categories of nonroad vehicles that contribute to such pollution.⁴⁰ In its October 5, 2001 Federal Register notice, which proposed the snowmobile standards, the Agency identified 7 areas in Alaska, Washington, Colorado, Oregon, and Montana that have significant populations of snowmobiles and have failed to attain the air quality standard for CO.⁴¹

Manufacturers of snowmobiles and other nonroad vehicles note, however, that carbon monoxide concentrations have declined [chiefly as a result of auto emission standards] and that none of the 7 areas identified by the Agency has exceeded the CO

³⁸ Personal communication, Sean Smith, Bluewater Network, September 27, 2001.

³⁹ 59 Federal Register 31306, June 17, 1994.

⁴⁰ 65 Federal Register 76790, December 7, 2000.

⁴¹ 66 Federal Register 51105-51107, October 5, 2001. The Preamble to the final rule revised the list of 7 areas, identifying 6 nonattainment areas in which the Agency believes snowmobiles are significant contributors to CO concentrations; the Agency added that there are 6 additional areas that have not been classified nonattainment, but where air quality monitoring indicates a need for CO control. See Preamble to the Final Rule, previously cited, p. 18.

standard in recent years, even if they are still formally classified as nonattainment. CO nonattainment today is essentially a problem in urban “hot spots,” according to manufacturers, and snowmobiles make no contribution to that problem.⁴²

Legislative Issues

Members of Congress, both from western and other states, have expressed an interest in whether there will be continued snowmobile access to national parks. Four hearings have been held on these issues since the 106th Congress, and a provision was attached to the FY2001 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-554) to block the National Park Service from reducing snowmobile use in any units of the National Park System during the 2000-2001 or 2001-2002 winter seasons.⁴³ In the 108th Congress, Representative Holt has twice attempted to amend Interior Department Appropriation bills to prohibit spending to manage recreational snowmobile use in the three Yellowstone area park units except in accordance with the Clinton Administration rule phasing out snowmobiles. The first such amendment (H.Amdt. 266 to H.R. 2691) was defeated on a tie vote, 210-210, July 17, 2003. The second attempt (H.Amdt. 563 to H.R. 4568) was defeated on June 17, 2004, by a vote of 224-198.

Other legislation has been introduced, but not acted on. In the first session of the 107th Congress, two bills addressing snowmobile use were introduced: S. 365, introduced by Senator Thomas, to require the National Park Service to allow continued access to snowmobiles; and H.R. 1465, introduced by Representative Holt, with the opposite intention — to codify proposed NPS restrictions. The Holt bill would have set forth a general prohibition on snowmobile access to national parks, with a limited number of exceptions — for parks in Alaska, for Voyageurs National Park, for access to private inholdings for owners and their guests, and for designated routes that provide direct access to public lands open to public snowmobile use in the vicinity of a park. These restrictions would have applied to all snowmobiles irrespective of their emission or noise levels. S. 365, on the other hand, assumed that EPA regulations would result in cleaner, quieter machines. The bill would have preserved access to the parks for current unregulated snowmobiles for a period of at least five years after the date of enactment, and would have directed the National Park Service, at the completion of that period, to propose noise standards for snowmobile use in national parks “taking into account noise reductions achieved in conjunction with” EPA’s emission standards. Neither of these bills has been reintroduced in the 108th Congress.

Bills addressing snowmobile issues were also introduced in the second session of the 107th Congress. In response to the draft Supplemental EIS on access to Grand Teton, Yellowstone, and the Rockefeller Parkway and the NPS plan to allow snowmobiles access, H.R. 5044 was introduced. This bill, introduced by Representative Holt with 124 original co-sponsors, would have banned snowmobile

⁴² Statement of Ed Klim, President, ISMA, at EPA Public Hearing, Washington, D.C., October 24, 2001.

⁴³ The text of the snowmobile provision can be found in the conference report, H.Rept. 106-1033, which contains the text of nine bills incorporated by reference in the act.

access to the three areas. An identical bill, S. 2697, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Reid. Bills similar to these (H.R. 1130 and S. 965) have been reintroduced in the 108th Congress by the same sponsors, but no action has been taken on them.

Finally, two bills were introduced during the second session of the 107th Congress in response to the closure to snowmobiles of a portion of Denali National Park, discussed previously. Representative Don Young's H.R. 4677 would have opened portions of the closed sections of Denali to snowmobiles, but continued to prohibit use in other portions of the closed sections; a similar bill, S. 2589, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Murkowski. These bills were not acted on, and have not been reintroduced.

Conclusions

Despite the promulgation of EPA's snowmobile standards and the D.C. Circuit Court decisions on snowmobile access to national parks and snowmobile emission standards, snowmobile issues remain far from resolved. EPA and the National Park Service have been charged by the courts with revising emission standards and developing snowmobile access requirements, respectively. Congress may address some of these issues, and the courts will also continue to be involved in their resolution. Court action will include the continuing legal proceedings over Yellowstone access, as well as the suits filed regarding emission standards for snowmobiles.

Public interest in these issues remains significant: the reopening of the Yellowstone area Winter Use Plan in early 2003 generated 350,000 public comments. As a result, Congress can also be expected to retain an interest in the resolution of these issues.