



Letters

Spring 2022

The Ultimate Energy Wrecking Ball — Joe Biden

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As Appearing in The Daily Caller



Energy independence and security are basic requirements for a stable economy and national security in the modern world. Americans learned that lesson the hard way in the 1970s — even, presumably, President Joe Biden.

Yet since Biden has been president, he has done everything in his power to wreck American energy independence and security. And more is coming. What gives?

A brief overview of recent U.S. energy history is in order.

Although former President Jimmy Carter was largely a failure as president, he did do at least one thing right. To cut U.S. dependence on foreign oil, Carter and Congress unleashed the U.S. coal industry through the National Energy Act of 1978. Coal replaced oil as a means of generating electricity. By the time of the Obama administration, the production of coal had doubled to generate more than 50% of our electricity.

Then the Obama climate agenda struck.

Although climate legislation failed in Congress during 2009 and 2010, former President Barack Obama weaponized his EPA against the coal industry, cutting the use of coal to generate electricity back to about the Carter administration level. What kept our country from energy disaster during the Obama years was the concurrent rise of fracking, which provided the natural gas to replace the lost coal generation.

Although Obama was no fan of fracking, he was happy to allow it as a practical means of facilitating his war on coal. But fracking wasn't going to be allowed forever as Hillary Clinton only viewed it as a "bridge fuel" to a fossil fuel-free future.

The election of President Donald Trump paused the Democrat war on fossil fuels. Although Trump couldn't do much for the coal industry except to stop the government assault on it, he removed the threat of government action against fracking, which resulted in a world-changing record amount of U.S. oil and gas production.

Under Trump, the U.S. rather than OPEC dominated the global oil market — so much so that, in early 2020 at the beginning of the pandemic, a Russia-Saudi Arabia oil production war resulted in the price of oil briefly going negative. America's energy independence was secure,

Continued on Page 6

In This Issue

CA To Ban Gas Cars by 2035



Katie Grimes reports that that CA's Gov. Newsome announced that the state will no longer allow gas cars after 2035.

Page 2

Red lights – the devil's playground



Greg Walcher reports how British constables are writing drivers a ticket if they leave their car idling.

Page 3

Companies Should Reveal Chinese Ties



Steve Milloy writes in the Wallstreet Journal that American corporations should reveal how reliant they've become on Communist China.

Page 4

CA Tops Nation's Gas Prices...Again



With its draconian regulations and absurd taxes, CA once again leads the nation in the cost of gas, particularly diesel.

Page 4

Not here, not now, not this kind



Greg Walcher discusses the crazy energy policies that are eliminating tradition sources and replace them with unreliable renewables.

Page 5

Milloy Files Proposals with 3 U.S. Companies



Steve Milloy continued his effort of calling Corporate greenwashing by filing shareholder proposals with 3M, Verizon & ExxonMobil.

Page 6

Rolling Blackout State CA To Completely Ban Sale of Gas Cars

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



California can't even keep the power on during annual summer heat

“If you like your car, you can keep your car” may become the biggest lie ever in California. And I like my car.

While you may be able to keep your existing gas-powered car in California, any new car purchased after 2035 will have to be electric or other non-gas powered vehicle.

California Gov. Gavin Newsom issued an executive order September 2020 phasing out gas-powered cars, and requiring sales of all new passenger vehicles to be zero-emission by 2035, California Globe reported. The Governor’s Executive Order also addresses “closure and remediation of former oil extraction sites,” threatening the oil and gas industry in the state.

Fast forward: The California Air Resources Board announced new zero-emission vehicle regulations this week, which, if passed, would call for 35% of new car sales in the state to be battery or hydrogen-powered by 2026, up to 100% by 2035, the Globe reported.

“Pull away from the gas pumps,” Newsom said. “Let us no longer be victims of geopolitical dictators that manipulate global supply chains and global markets.”

2020 data showed that only 2% of all cars in California are even zero emission, likely because most people can’t afford to drive a \$60,000 electric luxury vehicle, or pay the \$3,000 to \$8,000 to install a home car-charging station in your garage.

The Air Resources Board order is a regulatory component to Gov. Gavin Newsom’s September 2020

executive order banning gas and diesel vehicles by 2035.

California can’t even keep the power on during annual summer heat or winter winds and storms. Last summer, state officials beseeched electric car owners not to charge their vehicles to help avoid rolling blackouts. Where are those officials now?

“If you build it they will come” is never a responsible formula for state policy.

While California pushes electric cars, they are only as clean as their electric power supply, which is primarily coal, the second-largest energy source for U.S. electricity generation.

It is important to remember that the California Air Resources Board grossly miscalculated pollution levels of 340 percent over real pollution levels, in a supposedly scientific analysis used to toughen the state’s clean air standards, and create the CARB’s Truck and Bus Rule, and the same CARB which was involved with the EPA diesel exhaust experiments on children at UCLA and USC.

Yet the CARB forged ahead with the Truck and Bus Rule’s diesel regulations anyway, and California’s elected supermajority never attempted to stop the corrupt agency.

Gov. Newsom’s latest order allows the California Air Resources Board to develop new passenger vehicle and truck regulations requiring increasing volumes of new zero-emission vehicles sold, as well as developing new regulations affecting medium-and heavy-duty vehicles, and to develop strategies with state, federal and local entities to achieve 100 percent zero-emission from off-road vehicles and equipment operations in the State by 2035, Chris Micheli reported at the Globe.

“Our cars shouldn’t make wildfires worse and create more days filled with smoky air. Cars shouldn’t melt glaciers or raise sea levels threatening our cherished beaches and coastlines,” Newsom said in a statement.

However, California’s rolling

blackouts and cataclysmic wildfires are not the results of climate change, but are the direct result of deficient leadership and destructive energy policies.

Meanwhile, more climate propaganda is heading our way – this time from “Legendary labor leader Dolores Huerta and State Senator Monique Limón.” These two non-climate scientists “announce SB 1230, a bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve public health, and increase equity by accelerating California’s clean car revolution.”

Huerta is a multi-decade farm labor union agitator and community organizer, and Limón’s biographies refer to her as a “University Administrator,” an “Educator,” and “University Official,” but “politician” is more accurate: She served six years on the Santa Barbara Unified School District Board of Education. Additionally, she served in the capacity of Assistant Director for the McNair Scholars Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara prior to serving in the Assembly,” according to a UC Santa Barbara newspaper article.

They say “SB 1230 does not create new programs, rather, it puts equity front and center by simplifying and streamlining existing clean car incentive programs to benefit low-and moderate-income Californians.

This bill is just another climate change shakedown.

“The bill further initiates a rapid build out of new clean car charging infrastructure, with a specific focus on installation in low-income neighborhoods,” Huerta and Limón say.

SB 1230 is really just another climate change shakedown, and proposes government subsidized charging stations in low-income neighborhoods where people who can barely afford food and rent, will certainly not be able to afford the very expensive electric and hybrid cars that use the “car charging infrastructure.”

But it won’t matter anyway with California’s 4-season energy shortage and rolling blackouts. □

Red lights – the devil’s playground

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



An ancient expression says “the idle mind is the devil’s playground.” When it comes to air pollution, it could be said about the idle car. Idling engines pollute the air.

A British consulting company, Cambustion, studied the use of gasoline by idling vehicles, with startling conclusions. Cars use more fuel, and emit more pollutants, idling for 10 seconds than turning off and restarting the engine. Numerous other studies have confirmed that.

In response, British constables now issue hefty fines to drivers idling more than five minutes. Some U.S. states are following suit, Massachusetts threatening \$25,000 fines for five-minute idling. A Canadian study (converting the original metric numbers) found that for every gallon of gasoline used, a vehicle produces 20 pounds of carbon dioxide.

The Environmental Protection Agency agrees that 10 seconds of idling “uses more fuel and produces more emissions that contribute to smog and climate change than stopping and restarting your engine.” It estimates that idling vehicles in the U.S. waste six billion gallons of fuel annually, and that America’s 250 million personal vehicles generate 30 million tons of CO₂ a year while idling.

Unquestionably, traffic jams and congestion cause major emissions. It is all wasted, because idling produces no movement, and slows economic activity.

Recommended solutions, in the U.S. and abroad, mostly include fining drivers for excessive idling, and encouraging people to shut off engines if not moving within seconds. The EPA likes hybrid-electric vehicles that shut off when not moving, a stop-start technology now available on many new vehicles. And commercial vehicles can be equipped to provide power to accessories without the engine running.

These are all good ideas, but notice they all have something in common. They’re all about drivers and vehicle choices, as if government can do nothing, other than force particular behaviors. But government’s own choices exacerbate traffic congestion, most egregiously with traffic lights.

An intersection I navigate regularly has two traffic lights 100 yards apart, one at a busy interchange, the other at a parking lot, which never has more than two cars waiting. But the lights are out of sync, causing backups of 50-75 cars every rush hour, making every driver wait at least twice at the same light, idling at least three minutes. That’s an extreme example, but not uncommon.

There are 350,000 traffic lights in the U.S., including more than 100 in the Grand Junction area and 13,000 in Denver. A Texas Transportation Institute survey revealed that U.S. drivers wasted 6.9 billion hours stuck in traffic, including traffic lights, a shocking 42 hours a year for the average rush-hour commuter. The cost was estimated at \$160 billion in wasted time and fuel per year. A USA Today report put the annual national cost closer to \$300 billion.

That doesn’t just hit our pocketbooks, but also the air we breathe. The National Association of City Transportation Officials recommends the perfect timing for a red

light (hint: a few seconds less than it takes to send that text message). They recommend 60-90 seconds, meaning an urban driver averages 75 seconds at each red light. Cities like Denver set them at two minutes at busier intersections. You can do the math, but the short version is that if you start driving when you’re 15 and stop when you’re 65, you will have spent almost four months sitting at stop lights.

Governments can change that dramatically, with existing technology that can leave the lights green if no cars are coming. Even in the 1950s, Grand Junction posted signs on 4th and 5th Streets telling motorists that the signals were set at 22 MPH, so drivers at that speed could make them all green. Today the city has at least a dozen traffic volume cameras, and Colorado now has 140 roundabouts, which completely eliminate traffic lights.

Some cities link their lights to a central control center. Mesa, Arizona’s 400 signals are connected to a computerized system, where lights are synchronized, and timings adjusted, as traffic requires. Such technologies are shown to reduce congestion and emissions by 20 percent or more, but a Guidehouse Insights report says only seven percent of North America’s signalized intersections have “adaptive traffic-control technology.” It costs \$20,000 or more per intersection to install such technology, but how much is cleaner air worth?

Compared with America’s massive investment in other technologies to reduce air pollution — \$150 billion on wind energy in the last decade, for example — the cost of reduced idling, preventing millions of tons of greenhouse gases, is a bargain. Because traffic lights are never really “green.” □

Companies Should Come Clean on Their Ties to China

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow

As Appearing in the *Wall Street Journal*



The Securities and Exchange Commission is prodding publicly owned companies to disclose how Russia's invasion of Ukraine is affecting their operations. BP, Shell and Exxon Mobil have booked charges of \$25.5 billion, \$8.4 billion and \$3.4 billion respectively, but the major oil companies aren't the only ones losing money. General Electric took a \$200 million charge, and McDonald's is losing \$50 million a month from closing its Russian operations. Netflix suspended service in Russia and lost 700,000 viewers, the first time in a decade its viewership has declined.

All this is peanuts compared with what might lie ahead should China attempt to invade Taiwan. Trade between the U.S. and China was worth \$615 billion in 2020, according to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. In contrast, U.S.-Russia trade was only worth about \$35 billion in 2019.

But that disparity in trade volume is only the tip of the iceberg. The stuff we get from China—from antibiotics and smartphones to minerals and metals needed for green technology—is much more important than almost anything we get from Russia. The Biden administration wants to commit the U.S. to a green agenda, but 80% of the rare-earth minerals needed for that technology are processed by China.

China is a widely known serial violator of human and civil rights whose leaders say they intend to displace the U.S. because the lone international superpower by 2049. The U.S. has a longstanding dedication to defend Taiwan, which China might try to seize by drive. U.S.-China relations are tense over points together with China's army growth, actions associated to Covid, intellectual-property theft, tariffs and solar-panel dumping.

China has additionally publicly indicated that it might use its industrial capabilities, equivalent to rare-earth mineral processing, for strategic functions in opposition to adversaries. Beijing lately levied giant tariffs on imported Australian items in retaliation for Canberra's makes an attempt to research the origin of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The excellent news is the SEC

employees has lately given the inexperienced gentle to my shareholder proposal for a "Communist China Audit," which asks firms to speak in confidence to shareholders the extent to which their enterprise depends on China. This yr, I filed this proposal with 3M and Verizon. The former has substantial enterprise operations in China—greater than 6% of 3M's workforce is predicated there. At the start of the pandemic, 3M needed to safe Beijing's permission to export Chinese-made N95 masks to the U.S.

Verizon doesn't itself have important operations in China, however it might materially have an effect on its enterprise if China stopped exporting smartphones and different know-how to the U.S. As many as 70% of all smartphones shipped to the U.S. come from China. Verizon's management requested the SEC employees to exclude my proposal, however the request was denied.

Shareholders have the precise to know the extent to which their investments rely upon U.S.-China relations. The Russian invasion of Ukraine, together with the rising closeness between Moscow and Beijing, has elevated the potential of a harmful U.S.-China confrontation. The 3M and Verizon shareholder proposals might be voted on May 10 and 12, respectively. But the time for all firms to arrange and to make sufficient disclosures of fabric data concerning China is now. □

California Tops Nation's Highest Gas Prices at \$6.43 Per Gallon

by Katie Grimes, Senior Media Fellow

As Appearing in the *California Globe*



California is once again at the top of the charts, leading the nation in... wait for it... gas and diesel prices.

AAA reports today's national average of \$5.014 per gallon — California comes in at a cool \$6.436 per gallon for Regular, and nearly \$7.00 per gallon for Diesel.

California's prices greatly top the national averages: The average for a gallon of regular gas in California is \$6.436 per gallon, and a gallon of diesel is \$6.991.

The Globe just took the photo above Monday June 13, 2022 at a Chevron gas station in Sacramento, CA.

With Regular at \$6.79 and Diesel at \$7.39, California's gas prices are much higher than the state average and even higher than

Hawaii and Alaska.

The Wall Street Journal reported Monday: "California, Oregon and Washington have traditionally had higher fuel costs than the national average due to a lack of refineries and pipelines that can pump in domestic oil, said Patrick De Haan, head of petroleum analysis at price tracker GasBuddy. These states have to pay higher prices to ship in oil, much of it from abroad, which then gets passed down to the consumer, he said."

AAA reports that Georgia drivers are paying on average \$4.484 per gallon of gas — the lowest in the country.

Florida drivers are paying \$4.891 per gallon of gas.

Indiana drivers are paying \$5.221 per gallon of gas.

Tennessee drivers are paying \$4.642 per gallon of gas.

Mississippi drivers are paying \$4.524 per gallon of gas.

Texas drivers are paying \$4.664 per gallon of gas.

California drivers are paying \$6.436

per gallon of gas.

The Wall Street Journal noted that "states along the Gulf Coast, including Texas and Louisiana, are among the states with the cheapest gas because of the abundance of fuel refineries, pipelines and domestic sources of oil in the region."

And with California's abundant petroleum industry regulations, highest-in-the-nation gas taxes, and special "summer blend," expect to see that \$6.436 per gallon of gas get much higher this summer — some predict over \$10.00 per gallon!

Gas Buddy explains the summer blends: "March-April refineries begin to produce summer gasoline blends. More than 14 different blends are produced during this period, due to different state regulations for reformulated gasoline and Reid vapor pressure requirements. May 1: Fuel terminals are required to sell only summer gasoline on May 1, while gas stations have until June 1 to complete the changeover to summer gasoline. The switch from winter to summer gasoline is one of the major factors behind seasonal fuel price increases in May." □

Not here, not now, not this kind

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



An Ellsworth, Maine, newspaper columnist lamented voters' defeat of a transmission line to bring renewable energy. "Talk about mixed messages. We want renewable energy but not here, not now, not this kind. We have to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, but we won't support a project to replace them."

Voter schizophrenia is not unique to Maine — it is nearly universal. It's understandable because no source of energy is entirely green. For 40 years energy companies, utilities and government researchers have studied the environmental impacts of energy. In some cases, that impact is immediate and local, as with smokestacks. In others, it's more long-term and geographically unspecific, as with global warming.

Worldwide, governments have established goals to wean their economies from oil, gas and coal — the most abundant, affordable and versatile sources of energy. Their use has created prosperity and history's highest standard of living. But they also come at an environmental price, as we all understand. So presidents, governors, town councils, prime ministers, monarchs and legislatures have agreed to reduce the use of fossil fuels and work toward powering their economies with renewables. Unfortunately, there is no such thing.

The sun, of course, is "renewable" in the sense that nothing mankind does affects it. But the solar panels, batteries and cables

used to capture its energy are made of minerals, no more renewable than oil. Running water in rivers is constantly replenished. But dams require concrete and turbines are made of steel and other metals, no more renewable than natural gas. Nuclear power is cheap, but uranium requires mining, no more renewable than coal. What is the answer — electric cars, trucks, buses and trains? That depends on where the electricity comes from. With the current mix of energy sources, that really just means vehicles powered by coal instead of oil.

We spend billions subsidizing wind energy, once thought to be the most promising renewable. But while wind is renewable, wind machines are not. They are manufactured using steel, fiberglass, plastic (oil), iron, copper and aluminum. They don't emit greenhouse gases, but mining those materials does. And now, a Justice Department lawsuit sheds shocking light on the impact of wind machines on wildlife.

The first megawatt wind turbines, on CA's Altamont Pass, were fast-spinning propellers that many environmentalists nicknamed "Condor Cuisinarts." Modern turbines seem to turn slower, but they are so huge that the tips of their blades move at 200 miles an hour. And they still kill thousands of birds every year.

The Justice Department lawsuit, filed against the world's largest generator of wind power, revealed that the machines have killed tens of thousands of bald eagles. NextEra Energy's machines in Wyoming are documented to have killed 150 eagles since 2012, and the settlement includes a \$150 million fine (\$1 million per eagle), along with another \$27 million to be spent on "mitigation measures" intended to prevent future eagle kills. Experts

say "mitigation" means locating machines away from eagle habitat. In other words, there is no way to stop birds from flying into nearby blades, except not to build them.

Setting aside the irony of government subsidizing and encouraging the development, and then fining companies that participate — and the fact that the government itself put a wind turbine near eagle nests in the Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge — killing eagles is illegal. Dead eagle carcasses are shipped to the government's "Eagle Depository" in Denver. At first, California was the only state with wind turbines in eagle habitat, and the Repository in 1997 reported wind turbines were among the main sources of 800 eagle carcasses it received that year. By 2014, an explosion of wind turbine construction, fueled by federal tax subsidies, raised that number to over 3,000 eagle carcasses annually. So the government stopped reporting the numbers. Today the U.S. has 80 times more wind generation than in 1997.

In 2014, NBC reported that the Repository had processed about 42,000 dead eagles and was receiving 2,500-3,000 more a year. Robert Bryce, of "Power Hungry Podcast" did the math: "over 60,000 eagle carcasses have been secretly shipped to this repository." That's because Congress classified wind machine eagle kills as "business trade secrets," and amended the Freedom of Information Act to exempt this data from public disclosure.

Clearly, all energy decisions bring trade-offs. Long-term climate change that we cannot see or accurately measure, or dead bald eagles that we can? Most of us might be like the Ellsworth voters, who want renewable energy, but not here, not now, not this kind. □

Biden's Wrecking Ball (Cont.)

gasoline was cheap and the economy was strong.

Enter Biden — and disaster.

Since Biden has been president, he has done everything in his power to wreck American energy independence and security in the name of his climate agenda. On day one, he killed the Keystone XL pipeline and stopped new oil and gas drilling on federal lands. His Environmental Protection Agency went to war against fracking by revoking fracking-friendly Trump reforms. Oil and gas industry investment was chilled while energy demand picked up as the pandemic shutdowns eased. Gasoline prices began their steep climb.

The Biden administration virtually cheered higher gas prices as a

necessary condition for advancing its climate agenda. While Biden claimed he was doing everything possible to reduce gas prices, for example, by releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the amounts released were in fact trivial and had no effect on gasoline prices. Biden then falsely accused the oil industry of price gouging and sitting on 9,000 unused oil leases on public lands.

And as if all that was not bad enough, the Biden administration continues to do everything it can to block and discourage fossil fuel production and transportation.

The Democrat dominated Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has issued rules to block new pipelines on the basis of climate. The Biden administration recently rolled back

Trump reforms to the National Environmental Policy Act to make it easier for green groups to block fossil fuel projects on public lands. And the Biden EPA plans to step up the war against fossil fuels in the coming months with pointlessly stringent air quality rules that will give EPA power over every aspect of fossil fuel production, transportation and use.

The goal of these Biden policies is to drive fossil fuel prices permanently higher, in hopes of forcing Americans to embrace even higher-priced wind, solar and electric vehicle technologies.

This is a policy of chaos for our economy and national security. Unless Congress can muster the necessary votes to put an end to these Biden policies, we will be stuck with them until at least 2025. □

Milloy Files Shareholder Proposals with Verizon, 3M & ExxonMobil



Steve Milloy, E&E Legal Senior Policy Fellow, and Junkscience.com Founder is no stranger to filing shareholder proposals to keep large corporations from ignoring their fiduciary responsibility to their stock owners as they pursue Leftist policies. Milloy currently has upcoming shareholder proposals with the following corporations:

ExxonMobil: 'Nuisance Shareholder' Shareholder

Milloy writes: *If you hate activists pretending to be shareholders at corporate annual meetings, vote for my "Nuisance Shareholder" proposal at ExxonMobil. My "shareholder proposal to end all shareholder*

proposals" would encourage management to end the ridiculous and counterproductive process of shareholder proposals, a process through which fossil fuel-hating activists have almost seized control of ExxonMobil.

Verizon: 'Communist China Audit' Shareholder Proposal

Milloy explains: *If you own shares of Verizon, the shareholder voting for the annual meeting has now opened. This year's voting includes my proposal for a "Communist China Audit." My proposal and Verizon's (lame) response are below. I will be submitting this proposal to other companies next year. You can as well. The Verizon annual meeting is May 12, 2022. You can read about the struggle over this proposal at the Securities and Exchange Commission here.*

3M: 'Communist China Audit' Shareholder Proposal

Milloy says: *If you own shares of 3M, the shareholder voting for the annual meeting has started. This year's voting includes my proposal for a "Communist China Audit." My proposal and 3M's (lame) response are below. I will be submitting this proposal to other companies next year. You can as well. The 3M annual meeting is May 10, 2022.* □

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
202-810-2001
Info@eelegal.org
www.eelegal.org