



Letters

Winter 2020

Milloy to Present Anti-Greenwashing Proposal at Exxon-Mobil Annual Meeting



On March 20, 2020, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) ruled that ExxonMobil must consider E&E Legal senior policy fellow and Junkscience.com author Steve Milloy's shareholder proposal at the company's Annual Shareholder meeting in May.

The shareholder proposal, originally submitted in December, states that "beginning in 2020, ExxonMobil publish an annual report of the incurred costs and associated significant and actual benefits that have accrued to shareholders, the public health and the environment, including the global climate, from the company's environment-related activities that are voluntary and that exceed U.S. and foreign compliance and regulatory requirements."

The largest oil & gas company

in the world, with some of the most experienced lawyers on retainer, was unable to prevent Milloy's proposal from appearing as part of the May meeting agenda. They vehemently opposed his proposal.

"I out-lawyered ExxonMobil's high-priced, lawyers and white-shoe law firm to ensure my shareholder proposal will be included in ExxonMobil's 2020 proxy materials and will be voted on at its May shareholder meeting," said Milloy. "My anti-greenwashing proposal asks the climate bedwetting, pro-CO2 tax oil giant to report to shareholders on the actual costs and benefits of its climate-related activities."

This is not the first time the behemoth company has lost in an effort to silence Milloy and to reject his shareholder proposals. He's asked pertinent questions in the past like why is an oil & gas company getting in bed with radical environmentalists whose main objective is to put the traditional energy industry out of business and into bankruptcy as they've done with the coal companies.

Continued on Page 5

In This Issue

Republicans Push CCS



E&E Legal's Steve Milloy calls out Republicans for unnecessarily embracing carbon capture and storage.

Page 2

California's Green New Deal Act



E&E Legal's Katy Grimes details CA's Green New Deal proposal and how it's just as dangerous as its federal counterpart.

Page 3

Feel better now?



E&E Legal's Greg Walcher discussed the possibility of COVID-19 appearing in wolves.

Page 4

ExxonMobil Wins Big in Climate Change



E&E Legal's Craig Richardson reports how ExxonMobil won a frivolous NY climate change case.

Page 5

'Climate Is About Controlling You!



E&E Legal's Steve Milloy took to the airwaves to declare that the Left's push for "climate" isn't about the weather, it's about total control over...you!

Page 6

Republicans are buying into carbon capture foolishness

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing in the *Washington Examiner*



Few Republican politicians are interested in wrecking the economy with pointless climate regulations. But that doesn't mean they can't be pressured into less harmful but equally pointless regulations, such as carbon capture and storage.

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy recently unveiled a series of bills aimed at spending taxpayer money on carbon capture and storage research, subsidizing ongoing capture and storage, and promoting the so-called Trillion Trees Initiative.

The bills are the Republican response to polls reporting that young GOP voters favor some sort of climate action. But none of these bills and no form of carbon capture will accomplish anything — including appeasing climate activists.

First, the United States could stop emitting carbon dioxide today and for the remainder of the century, and there would only be about a 2% difference in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. This will not discernibly alter the Earth's climate.

Next, although tree planting might seem like a perfectly eco-friendly and nonpartisan way to capture carbon dioxide, it just isn't so. Trees and reforestation

actually contribute to climate warming, according to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The IPCC, which climate alarmists rely on as representing the consensus on climate, released a report last August stating that because trees darken the Earth's surface and therefore decrease the reflection of solar radiation back into space, the planting of trees in the Northern Hemisphere actually contributes to the greenhouse warming effect.

So apparently, rather than legislating a Trillion Tree Initiative, the GOP would have been better off offering a Paul Bunyan Initiative.

For decades now, oil drillers have used carbon dioxide captured from power plant smokestacks to produce otherwise hard-to-get-at oil. The process, called enhanced oil recovery, makes perfect economic sense on its own without any climate consideration. But the \$35 per ton subsidy that drillers get certainly sweetens that deal. McCarthy's new legislation would sweeten the subsidy to \$43.75.

And here's the rub: When the oil produced by enhanced recovery is burned, the carbon emitted is greater than the amount of carbon used and stored underground to produce the oil. So carbon capture and storage via enhanced recovery actually increase carbon dioxide emissions — and taxpayers are subsidizing this under the guise of fighting climate change.

The Bush and Obama administrations have already wasted

billions of dollars on projects to capture carbon dioxide from power plant smokestacks in hopes of pipelining the captured gas underground for perhaps hundreds of miles to inject the carbon dioxide underground and store it in saline formations. The projects either never got off the ground or captured very little carbon dioxide at an extremely high cost.

The new Republican legislation would also fund research and development of something called "direct air capture" of carbon dioxide. Think giant vacuum cleaners that suck in outdoor air and chemically remove the compound from the air. Occidental Petroleum is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build a direct air capture facility. It hopes to be able to capture 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide per year by 2022.

Even if this project succeeded, the reality is that humans emitted 55.3 billion tons of carbon dioxide in 2018 — and that figure is only going up, according to the U.N. It would take about 22,000 plants of the sort that Occidental is building, each costing hundreds of millions of dollars, to offset human emissions to reach "carbon neutrality."

Carbon capture and storage is essentially physically, financially, and politically impossible. But climate activists and renewable energy rent-seekers would never accept it anyway, since their goals are political power and getting rid of fossil fuels, respectively. That is a reality Republican politicians should capture and store for future use. □

California's Green New Deal Act

by Katie Grimes, Senior Media Fellow
As Appearing in the *California Globe*



Expensive but necessary' according to lawmakers

As California Globe reported early Monday, Assemblyman Rob Bonta (D-Oakland) held a press conference to announce the California Green New Deal Act. Bonta said the Act is needed “to boldly address the impacts of climate change and issues of equity throughout the state.”

“Science is telling us what to do,” Bonta said, and noted that his bill will be “big and expensive, but necessary.”

“The existential threat of climate change” is what led Bonta to draft this “big ambitious bill,” over concerns of the “limitless danger with climate change.”

“Just like FDR’s New Deal in 1932, this will meet today’s greatest challenge – climate change,” Bonta said. “It’s an existential threat.”

FDR’s New Deal wasn’t the success that many claim it was. Henry Morgenthau Jr., Secretary of the Treasury and close friend to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the primary architect of FDR’s New Deal, admitted seven years later, “We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work.” Historian Burton Folsom, the author of “New Deal or Raw Deal?: How FDR’s Economic Legacy Has Damaged America,” said Morgenthau made this “startling confession” during the seventh year of the New Deal. I attended a speech Folsom gave about the New Deal, and bought and read

his book.

Bonta’s bill is modeled after the Green New Deal bill proposed by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-New York). However, as the Globe reported, last year, Ocasio-Cortez’s Green New Deal bill was largely discredited when her chief of staff Saikat Chakrabarti admitted that the Green New Deal was not conceived as an effort to deal with climate change, but is a “how-do-you-change-the-entire economy thing,” leading many to believe that the Green New Deal is nothing more than a bait-and-switch socialist takeover of the U.S. economy.

“Same name, same pillars addressing climate change as we promote equity, but this is California’s Green New Deal, so it’s different,” Bonta said.

And it was very clear Monday as Bonta and nine other Democrat Assembly members spoke in support of the California Green New Deal Act, that this bill was also a “how-do-you-change-the-entire economy thing.” Each lawmaker spoke of the “existential threat of climate change,” and California being home to “the most poverty in the country.”

Bonta gave the example of those residents “living near freeways and sucking in dirty air” because of “our fossil fuel economy.”

“We are falling behind in equity – that’s what this bill is about,” said Assemblywoman Shirley Weber (D-San Diego). “Not having clean water in poor communities...”

Assemblyman Devin Mathis (R-Porterville) has tried for years to get his colleagues in the Legislature to pass his legislation to fund clean drinking water for the 10,000 very poor constituents in his district reliant on groundwater wells which wells went dry in the drought to no avail.

“This bill was created to

tackle inequality in this state,” said Assemblyman Robert Rivas (D-Hollister). “Man-made climate change — wildfire, floods, record heat waves, droughts – disproportionately impacts our lower income communities.”

Assemblywoman Eloise Reyes (D-San Bernardino) said her district “is one of the most disadvantaged areas in the state. It is clear that research studies show disadvantaged communities will benefit when we move forward with this. We must address poverty now.”

Reyes said that logistic industries in her district “bring in fossil fuels, and hurt my communities.”

“We must address the inequities and racial injustices, public health and environmental justice,” Reyes added. “They suffer from climate change more than everywhere else.”

The press conference offered no details on where the funding would come from for such an ambitions law, nor were there any specifics on how the high poverty and disadvantaged communities would be changed.

When asked about funding, Bonta replied, “When Congress goes to war, we don’t ask how much.”

At the press conference were:

Assemblyman Rob Bonta (D-Oakland)
Assemblyman David Chiu (D-San Francisco)

Assemblyman Kansen Chu (D-San Jose)
Assemblywoman Eloise Gomez-Reyes (D-San Bernardino)

Assemblyman Ash Kalra (D-San Jose)
Assemblyman Kevin McCarty (D-Sacramento)

Assemblyman Robert Rivas (D-Hollister)

Assemblywoman Shirley Weber (D-San Diego)

Sierra Club California,

Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Public Advocates, Courage Campaign. □

Feel better now?

by Greg Walcher, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing in *The Daily Sentinel*



Last week's column about wolves carrying coronavirus touched a nerve with some readers, concerned about the current epidemic. One took me to task about scientific accuracy, so it makes sense to clarify it. To be sure, I get taken to task a lot for the views expressed here, and mostly it's rewarding to know someone is reading. I've even been told a national environmental organization monitors this space, and occasionally pays people to respond with its carefully crafted talking points.

This, however, was from a scientist I've known for years, one whose credentials are beyond question, and whose opinion I greatly respect. He assures me that "There is no evidence whatsoever that wolves carry COVID-19," the specific coronavirus so much in the news lately. As he says, "There is a great diversity and many species of coronaviruses in nature." Indeed, those include hoof-and-mouth disease, which infects deer, elk, cattle, and sheep; Canine respiratory coronavirus (CRCoV); and Pantropic canine coronavirus. Wolves are also common carriers of bubonic plague, hydatid disease, and alveolar echinococcosis (AE), a disease caused by tapeworms found in wolves, foxes, and coyotes. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta says it causes tumors in the liver, lungs, brain, and other organs that, if left untreated, can be fatal. I don't know anybody who wants more of that in

Colorado, either.

Coronaviruses are very closely related. They are "zoonotic," meaning they can be transmitted from animals to humans. In humans, they cause illnesses ranging from the common cold to very severe respiratory diseases, including Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). You might remember the SARS epidemic of 2002-03, which infected 8,000 people around the world, killing about a tenth of them. It is a form of coronavirus called SARS-CoV. The current outbreak is called SARS-CoV-2, showing how closely the strains are related. If you're confused about the alternate names of COVID-19 and SARS-CoV-2, that's only because the World Health Organization names the disease, but the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses names the species. Only government researchers can dream up such distinctions. All SARS and coronavirus strains are closely related.

In fact, last month university researchers in China using genomic sequencing found a 99% match between the coronavirus found in pangolins (the scaly armadillo-like creatures) and SARS-CoV-2. Other labs later found that the two strains share only 90.3 percent of their DNA, so we can breathe easier knowing the disease probably did not originate with pangolins. So where did it come from?

This coronavirus strain is most often carried by bats, though this outbreak is said to have originated at an open market in Wuhan, where vendors were selling wolves, foxes, rats, peacocks, bats, and other "exotic" species that are considered delicacies in China. Last week I called that story "impossible to verify" because China does not welcome

the press. Since then, CNN aired video of the market, and the CDC now agrees that "Early on, many of the patients at the epicenter of the outbreak in Wuhan... had some link to a large seafood and live animal market, suggesting animal-to-person spread." The Chinese government has shut the market down, and banned trade in such species, though it isn't the first time China has tried that. In 2003, civet cats were banned and culled, when it was discovered they were the source of SARS.

People don't generally eat bats, but Hong Kong's Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department says "Scientists suspect the virus... originated in bats before passing it on to another species, possibly a small wild mammal, that passed it on to humans." The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control agrees: "Coronaviruses... circulate among animals, with some of them also known to infect humans. Bats are considered as natural hosts of these viruses, yet several other species of animals are also known to be a source." For example, MERS was transmitted by camels and SARS by civet cats.

Introducing non-native species — tamarisk on the riverbanks, kudzu vines in California, zebra mussels in the Great Lakes, or pythons in the Everglades — always has a significant impact on native ecosystems, and often a deadly impact on native species. It is a bad idea.

It cannot be known how many new and strange diseases could be introduced to Colorado by non-native wolves forced in by ballot initiative. We do know as many as three-fourths of the gray wolves in Alaska carry Canine coronavirus. Wolves do not wash their hands, use sanitizer, or wear face masks. □

ExxonMobil Wins Big in Climate Change Trial

by Craig Richardson, President
As appearing in the *InsideSources*



Nearly every American depends on petroleum products in their daily lives, and today they can rest more soundly, for now at least.

Last month, a New York State Supreme Court judge found that the state's attorney general failed to establish evidence that ExxonMobil engineered a "long-standing fraudulent scheme ... to deceive investors and the investment community ... concerning the company's management of the risks posed to its business by climate change."

The decision followed three-and-a-half years of trial, investigation and pretrial discovery that required ExxonMobil to produce millions of pages of documents, dozens of witnesses, and millions of dollars in legal costs. The decision is a major blow to climate activists aiming to bankrupt energy produc-

ers as a means of keeping America's vast energy resources locked in the ground. Their planned wave of litigation intended to achieve through the courts what they cannot in the legislature. Luckily for the American consumers, this lawsuit turned out to be a dud.

But New York's lawsuit against ExxonMobil is just one of many climate suits, several still pending in the courts.

The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals will hear oral arguments in *City of Oakland v. BP P.L.C.* in February. The cities of Oakland and San Francisco argue that the five largest investor-owned oil companies contributed to a public nuisance — climate change — by producing and selling oil and gas. A federal judge has already ruled against the cities, finding that courts are not the appropriate venue for addressing climate policy. A similar lawsuit was brought by New York City, which was also rejected by a federal judge. City officials are appealing the ruling.

The judges ruled that managing greenhouse gas emissions is reserved to the Environmental

Protection Administration under the Clean Air Act and that plaintiffs cannot use tort law as a means of setting global warming-related regulatory policy.

Singling out a few large companies in the energy industry is meritless and unfair. In fact, it's just a "get-rich-quick" scheme, something the American consumer will end up subsidizing if the Greenies prevail. A broad approach involving many industries and nations is the only responsible way to discuss and address environmental issues. In fact, the oil and gas industry is already part of the solution. The surge of American shale oil and gas production has fundamentally altered not only the economics of energy production but has also led to environmental improvements.

This climate litigation debacle is falling apart as many legal analysts predicted. The New York attorney general's office lost big. With a watchful eye on coming decisions in California, New York, and in other states, our nation's largest energy producers and the consumers who rely on affordable, reliable energy can only hope these baseless lawsuits will finally end. □

Milloy's Exxon-Mobil Greenwashing Proposal (Cont.)



At the company's May 2017 Annual Meeting, Milloy submitted a shareholder proposal calling out management for betraying shareholders by "aiding and abetting"

extremist "climate activists" enemies. His first ExxonMobil shareholder proposal occurred in May 2008 when he ripped "climate activist poseur-shareholders."

"Large global corporations love regulations as they disproportionately hurt smaller and mid-size companies, thus killing competition," said E&E Legal President Craig Richardson. "Exxon-Mobil's cynical embrace of the economy-killing 'green agenda' is an attempt to return

to its monopolistic roots when J.D. Rockefeller owned the company."

The Energy & Environment Legal Institute (E&E Legal) is a 501(c)(3) organization that champions responsible and balanced environmentalism, which seeks to conserve the nation's natural resources while ensuring a stable and robust economy through energy dominance. Specifically, E&E Legal advocates responsible resource development, conservation, sound science, and respect for property rights. □

Climate Is Not About Controlling the Weather, It's About Controlling You!

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing in *Breitbart*



Global warming isn't really about climate but about leftist control freakery, author, lawyer and energy expert Steve Milloy told Breitbart News Editor-in-Chief Alex Marlow on Sirius XM.

Milloy said CO2 emissions are never going to go down because they are a product of human progress. But we shouldn't worry because this is just another sign of rising living standards.

"The bottom line is 'climate' is not about controlling the weather; it's about controlling you", Milloy told Marlow, in a broad-ranging discussion about global warming and the hypocrisy of the environmental movement.

Marlow began by expressing skepticism about some of the claims made by environmental advocates, especially the celebrities who insist that the planet is doomed while continuing to fly everywhere. His particular obsession, he said, was the ever-worsening Los Angeles traffic: shouldn't the environmentalists have solved this problem by now? How did it get to become so bad that celebrities – such as the Kobe Bryant – now choose to fly over it in helicopters instead?

Milloy said:

"There is not a climate bedwetter who is not a total hypocrite. They all claim they are worried about climate change but they don't do anything to reduce

their own emissions. Not that that would make any difference anyway [...]

Emissions are never going to down. Our lives are entirely dependent on fossil fuels. There is no replacement. Emissions are going up. There's nothing anybody is doing to cut them. Even when they reduce their emissions all they're doing them is transferring them to China."

But none of this is a problem because standards of living are continuing to rise and rise, Milloy said. By the end of this century there maybe another five billion people on the planet but global warming will help rather than hinder them: the extra warmth and the extra atmospheric CO2 are helping to green the planet, meaning that it is possible to feed more people.

Why then, Marlow asked, do they keep on telling children that they are doomed? Milloy said:

Climate change is completely counterfactual. There's nothing to support the narrative. What does the left want? Control over all our lives. And part of its strategy was to start propagandising children, which they began 15 or 20 years ago to the point where it is second nature to them to think: "We are destroying the planet [...]" It's a form of psychological warfare. They want it to be on everybody's mind.

Milloy cited the Australian bush fires as an example of this strategy: there have been many, many bush fires in Australia before (including a particularly destructive outbreak in 1939) and there is strong evidence that the latest were exacerbated by arson and by improper land management.

But it suits the left not to address these issues because the disaster helps their cause, Milloy observed:

They like to see the world

burning because it plays into their psychological narrative.

This, Milloy and Marlow agreed, explains why in California so little has been done to address the underlying causes of wild fires. The greens don't want to solve the problem because it helps their cause.

Finally, Milloy talked about Greta the Climate Puppet:

She's fronting a movement and it's hard to know who is behind it. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of Germany – German intelligence told her that [Russian leader Vladimir] Putin was funding this Youth Climate Strike movement, which Greta fronts...

[...] but you made a good point at the beginning. It's really pathetic that climate has now come down to this 17-year-old girl who admits that she knows nothing about climate science. When she testified in Congress and they asked her to describe why she was worried she couldn't [...] It's really ridiculous. The faces of the climate movement are Greta, a 17-year old school drop out who knows nothing, actors like Leonardo di Caprio and Hanoi Jane Fonda. This is supposed to be a genuine crisis – yet this is who is pushing it. □

E&E Legal Letter is a quarterly publication of the Energy and Environment Legal Institute (E&E Legal). The publication is widely disseminated to our key stakeholders, such as our members, website inquiries, energy, environment, and legal industry representatives, the media, congressional, legislative, and regulatory contacts, the judiciary, and supporters.

Energy & Environment Legal Institute
1350 Beverly Rd., Suite 115-445
McLean, VA 22101
(202)-758-8301
Info@eelegal.org
www.eelegal.org