E&E LEGAL
Energy & Environment Legal Institute

Letters

Fall 2025

Ford's EV Pickup Never Made Sense

by Steve Milloy, Senior Policy Fellow
As appearing on the *Daily Caller*

Ford Motor Co. announced this week that it is considering scrapping production of its electric F-150 Lightning pickup truck. The failed product is a small part of a much larger "green" disaster.

When the Lightning was launched in May 2021, an analyst told the New York Times: "The F-150 will put electric vehicles in a totally different realm. It's huge for Ford, but also huge for the whole industry. If you're going to electrify the whole vehicle fleet in the United States, the F-150 going electric is a big step in that direction." Ford CEO Jim Farley hyped the truck as being like "a smartphone that can tow 10,000 pounds."

As it turned out, though, the Lightning could actually only lose money for Ford – and consumers.

Ford hoped to sell 150,000 Lightnings per year but only sold 33,000 in 2024. Sales dropped precipitously in 2025 as Congress revoked California's EV mandate and President Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill Act terminated subsidies for EVs. And that was probably a blessing in disguise as Ford has lost a total of $13 billion on its EVs since 2023, amounting to tens of thousands of dollars lost on each EV sold.

The Lightning never made any sense for consumers. The initial cost differential between the gas-powered F-150 and the Lightning was about $15,500. When gas prices were at about $5 per gallon during the Biden administration, a driver could save $80 on a tank of gas.

While that sounds great, a driver would have to drive the Lightning more than 93,000 miles to break even on the purchase price. With today's gas prices at around $3 per gallon, the break-even mileage point is at almost 214,000 miles. Either way, it's a lot of driving just to break even financially.

If you imagined that driving a Lightning would help "save the world from climate change," Penn State researchers estimated that a Lightning could reduce your carbon footprint by about two tons per year, which is equivalent to the per person carbon footprint of a roundtrip transcontinental flight. You could reduce that trivial footprint to zero, but you would have to spend thousands of dollars buying and installing solar panels on your house. That doesn't make much sense either.

Ford's failure is not unique. It is merely standard performance – or rather, failure to perform – of anything and

Continued on Page 5

In This Issue

Unsolicited advice to the Sierra Club

Greg Walcher discusses how the once esteemed Sierra Club has jumped into "wokism" with both feet. Their latest detour into political correctness is to trash John Muir, a conservationist pioneer and the group's founder.

Page 2

Trump Pushes New CA Offshore Oil Leases

Katy Grimes reports that President Trump is proposing to open up U.S. waterways for oil drilling leases, including off of California's coast. CA Gov. Newsom vows to fight it.

Page 3

Dysfunctional Congress

Greg Walcher discusses how Congress, using the Congressional Review Act, overturned BLM resource management plans. The Biden plans would have locked up millions of acres of public lands.

Page 4

American Energy Dominance Coalition

E&E Legal joined other groups to form the American Dominance Council. The coalition also released "The Top 10 Regulatory and Fiscal Wins Under Energy Secretary Chris Wright."

Page 5

Paris Climate Deal: Decade-Old Disaster

Steve Milloy writes how the Paris Climate Deal turned 10 this year. In it's wake is more emissions - exactly what it sought to limit - and trillions of dollars of wasted spending.

Page 6

Unsolicited advice to the Sierra Club

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

After the 2020 George Floyd murder, the Sierra Club called for defunding police and reparations for slavery. It touched off an internal battle that tore the organization apart, leading to the ouster of two consecutive executive directors, employee layoffs, office closings, loss of members, and financial freefall. It also invited some unsolicited advice — from me.

My column, during the worst of the club's turmoil, strongly advised its leaders to "stay in your lane." "Stick to what you are known for, and good at, and you will remain effective and relevant," I advised. You may be shocked to learn that they did not heed that advice. Perhaps they considered it unfriendly?

Psychology Today just published suggested responses to shut down unsolicited advice. Say something like, "That's useful, but I prefer to handle it this way," or "I appreciate your input, but already have a plan." I didn't even get such platitudes for suggesting the Sierra Club stick to environmental issues.

Instead, the group doubled down on woke social activism, its director, Michael Brune, trashing the reputation of Sierra Club founder and conservation hero John Muir. Brune claimed the club had played a "substantial role in perpetuating white supremacy." It was an outrageous assertion, motivated by political correctness and based on the obscure fact that a young Muir had written some unflattering views after his travels among native American tribes. I hate judging people of the past by today's standards. Muir was a product of the 19th century, who thought like most 19th century Americans. He said some things modern leaders would not say. But he played no role whatsoever in perpetuating any notion of white supremacy, much less a "substantial role." He was not a Klansman, was never governor of Arkansas, managed no bus system in Montgomery, nor sanitation department in Memphis. He was a Wisconsin-bred northern Republican, an advocate of voting rights, an early progressive, a friend and ally of Theodore Roosevelt.

Brune's attempt to demonize and "cancel" John Muir from Sierra Club history, and other "social justice" campaigns ultimately cost him his job and led to two years of infighting. The board then hired Ben Jealous, a former head of the NAACP and president of People for the American Way, the extremist lefty group founded by Norman Lear. The board put political correctness above its historic mission, and it didn't work. Jealous was ultimately fired, too, but the direction has not changed. When the club was rich and influential beyond Muir's wildest dreams, its leaders continually reached beyond environment issues into other left-wing causes, including labor unions, race relations, LGBT rights, Palestine v. Israel, and illegal immigration. Its "equity language guide," suggested the word "Americans" was offensive.

The effect on its membership, funding, and influence can readily be seen in this week's headlines: "Sierra Club Went Woke and Now is Going Broke;" "Sierra Club Embraced Social Justice and Then Tore Itself Apart;" "Sierra Club Faces Uncertainty;" and "Sierra Club Deviated from Environmental Mission to Embrace Far-Left Projects. It Ripped Itself to Shreds."

It still calls itself the "largest and most influential grass roots environmental organization in the country." But in fact, it has lost 60% of the four million members and supporters it claimed just five years ago. Its new director, Loren Blackford, faces a $40 million budget shortfall, and employees remain up in arms about a mission that has morphed beyond anything familiar.

A Colorado-based volunteer reported being criticized for lobbying for more protection for wolves. She says a Sierra Club staffer asked, "What do wolves have to do with equity, justice, and inclusion?" The correct response would have been, "What do equity, justice, and inclusion have to do with the environment, which I thought was our mission?"

Former Board Chairman Aaron Mair was censured for asking "Do we want to still be the Sierra Club?" It's the right question. Digital marketing pioneer Gary Vaynerchuk says, "I'm pretty good at sticking to what I know... I talk about what I know because I'm petrified of being wrong." It's not even that the Sierra Club was necessarily wrong on social issues — reasonable people may debate that. It's that these are not the issues the club is known for, and more to the point, not the reason people join, donate, and support it.

Group leaders may continue to ignore advice. Another Psychology Today suggestion is, "That means a lot, but I'd value support more than solutions." Trouble is, if they don't solve the problem, they cannot count on support. ❐

President Trumps Newsom: Introduces New CA Offshore Oil Leases

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

Gov Newsom says plan is 'Dead on Arrival'

The Trump Administration just announced plans to open nearly all U.S. waters to oil drilling leases, including new offshore leases off of the California coast. The proposal outlines six lease sales in areas along the CA coast between 2027 and 2030, Offshore Technology reports.

California Governor Gavin Newsom immediately responded that Trump's proposal is "dead on arrival," doubling down on California's business-killing climate change policies, which don't include oil.

The plan is "dead on arrival in California — dead on arrival," Newsom told reporters at the COP30 climate summit in Brazil, Bloomberg News reported. It's "interesting he didn't put it in front of Mar-a-Lago," Newsom added, referring to Trump's Florida resort. "It's disgraceful."

The Trump administration is also is preparing to outline potential sales of drilling rights in waters near Alaska and in the Gulf of America, according to a draft five-year plan seen by the Washington Post.

Offshore Technology reports:

In June, ten oil and energy organisations led by the American Petroleum Institute submitted a joint letter.

This letter defended the prospect of new drilling near California and indicated the region's history of oil production from leases issued more than half a century ago.

It read: "All areas with the potential to generate jobs, new revenue and additional production to advance America's energy dominance should be considered for inclusion.

"Undiscovered resources could be readily produced given the array of existing infrastructure in the area, particularly in southern California," the letter added.

Industry representatives also supported drilling in the eastern Gulf, noting that proximity to developed areas could enable "new production relatively quickly".

However, California Attorney General Rob Bonta, along with attorneys general from nine other states, has pledged to resist offshore oil drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

In June, Bonta said, "President Trump is once again taking action to line the pockets of his Big Oil friends. This time, he is expanding oil and gas development by attempting to drill in our coastal communities. We won't stand idly by as the President continues to ignore science."

As the Globe reported in April, a report from the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC) Institute for Applied Economics – Oil and Gas in California: The Industry, its Economic Contribution and Major User Industries – found:

California's oil and gas industry provides 536,770 total jobs in California and 148,140 Californians are directly employed by its individual companies—along with the $338 billion total economic contribution to California's economy. Those numbers are something we all should feel proud of.

The U.S. has retaken the lead in global oil production, no thanks to California.

It's a stark contrast and gross negligence that Governor Newsom isn't going full steam ahead on California's fracking and horizontal drilling – oil and gas extraction, which has been safely used in the U.S. since 1947. "More than 17 million U.S. wells have been completed using the fracking process, producing more than seven billion barrels of oil and 600 trillion cubic feet of natural gas," the Independent Petroleum Association of America states.

Remember Newsom's climate grift:

Gov. Newsom signed a package of "sweeping legislation" in September 2022 to achieve statewide carbon neutrality as soon as possible, and no later than 2045, by establishing an 85% emissions reduction target, capping oil wells, slowing oil and gas permitting, making it impossible to increase refining capacity, and entirely phasing out oil and gas starting in two years.

That "sweeping set of laws" Newsom touted was 40 new climate change bills regulating California businesses and its people.

At the UN climate summit in Brazil, "Gov. Newsom urged nations to hold firm against further intimidation efforts, saying it was vital to remember 'Trump is temporary' and that 'you stand up to a bully,'" Yahoo News reported.

"The well-coiffed Democrat — seen as a potential 2028 presidential candidate — blasted Trump for twice leaving the Paris climate accord and for "doubling down on stupid through his support of Big Oil."

Newsom said a future Democratic administration would rejoin the Paris Agreement "without hesitation."

Notably, President Donald Trump skipped the UN's climate summit while California's Governor "grabbed the spotlight," Yahoo News also reported about the "well-coiffed Democrat." ❐

Just when you thought Congress dysfunctional

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

Last week, the Senate passed three Congressional Review Act resolutions overturning BLM resource management plans. What would have been called an earth-shattering precedent not so long ago was this time hardly noticed except by those who closely follow Interior and energy issues. The Biden-era resource management plans were designed to lock up millions of acres of public lands from the "multiple uses" required by law.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) was part of a small business package signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1996. It provided a tool Congress sometimes uses to overturn federal regulatory agency actions. It requires agencies to report any new rules to Congress and provides special procedures under which Congress can disapprove them. It applies to "major rules, non-major rules, and interim final rules" very broadly, even including agency actions that have not been subject to traditional notice-and-comment rulemaking, such as "guidance documents and policy memoranda."

When agencies report to Congress that they have adopted any new rules, Congress has 60 days to disapprove the rules before they go into effect. To disapprove a rule, the House and the Senate must pass a joint resolution, which the president must sign like any other law.

In passing the latest resolutions, the Senate used the CRA in an entirely new way. It had never been used to rescind land management plans, which some might have claimed are not "rules" under the CRA's definition. Yet there was no major fight about it on the Senate floor, unlike the battle earlier this year when the CRA was used against California's ban on gas-powered cars to cancel EPA "waivers" that had allowed California to ban gas-powered cars. Normally, states cannot impose environmental regulations that are stricter than federal standards, except if EPA grants "waivers," which the Biden EPA had done for California.

When the Senate passed CRA resolutions disapproving the EPA waivers, Democrats in Congress, environmental leaders, and others cried foul. Both the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Senate parliamentarian entered the debate, saying EPA's waivers were not technically "rules." But ultimately the Senate makes its own rules, and the parliamentarian doesn't have a vote. The resolutions were passed anyway and became law, effectively killing California electric vehicle mandates. This time, when rescinding the BLM management plans, the parliamentarian cleared the CRA resolutions without hesitation and they sailed through, and President Trump has already signed them into law.

That sends BLM back to the drawing board on three major plans. One was adopted by the Miles City, Montana Field Office, locking up virtually all of Montana's coal deposits in the Powder River Basin, which contains nearly 30% of the entire nation's coal supply. Second was the North Dakota Resource

Management Plan, which walled off over four million acres of public land in North Dakota, prohibiting coal leasing on virtually all that state's coal deposits, and stopping leasing on almost half of the available oil and gas acreage. Finally, the Central Yukon plan barred an LNG pipeline and other activity on over 13 million acres in Alaska, which already has 58 million acres of designated wilderness (and many other off-limits areas), more than all the other states combined. All three have now been disapproved by Congress.

Heads are turned and feathers are ruffled throughout the federal regulatory agencies, but in truth they ought to be getting used to Congress weighing in on such bureaucratic overreach. The CRA has been on the books for 30 years and has now been used by Congress to overrule regulatory agencies 35 times. The current Congress has enacted 15 CRA resolutions into law during 2025, the most ever. One such resolution was adopted during George W. Bush's first term in 2001, overruling a Clinton-era ergonomic workplace regulation. But 16 CRA resolutions were enacted during Trump's first term in 2017, three during Biden's term, and so far, 15 in Trump's second. It has been used by majorities of both parties and has become a useful tool for Congress because CRA resolutions require only simple majorities and are not subject to filibuster in the Senate.

CRA resolutions have overturned vastly unpopular Energy Department rules banning gas water heaters and restricting refrigerators and other appliances. The EPA has been overturned five times this year, and Cong. has used the CRA to rein in the National Park Service, Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management, and Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, as well as the BLM.

Opponents claim this process undermines ordinary governmental procedures. But what is more "ordinary" than Congress making the rules? ❐

E&E Legal, Other Groups, Form "American Energy Dominance Coalition"

The Energy and Environment Legal Institute, led by Steve Milloy, E&E Legal Senior Policy Fellow, joined The Heartland Institute, C-FACT, American Energy Institute, Consumers Defense, Truth in Energy Coalition, and Life: Powered to form the American Energy Dominance Coalition. The coalition created a "Top 10 Regulatory & Fiscal Wins under Secretary of Energy Chris Wright," highlighting the actions the Department of Energy has done in the past nine months to undo the burdensome and economy-killing regulations imposed by the Biden & Obama Administrations.

In less than 9 months, under Secretary Chris Wright, the U.S. Department of Energy launched the largest deregulatory effort in history, canceled billions in wasteful subsidies, and restored America's path toward true energy dominance:

1. The Department of Energy undertook the "largest deregulatory effort in history," rescinding or blocking 47 specific regulations and standards for a variety of consumer and commercial appliances, including Conservation Standards for Automatic Commercial Ice Makers, Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Prerinse Spray Valves, Water Use Standards for Faucets, and more.
- See: Energy Department Slashes 47 Burdensome and Costly Regulations (5/12/25)

2. DOE delayed, with an eye toward rescinding, energy-efficiency standards for federal buildings, saving millions of dollars in unnecessary upgrades.
- See: Clean Energy for New Federal Buildings and Major Renovations – Stay (5/5/25)

3. DOE streamlined the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process to cut Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) requirements by issuing new guidance that limits unnecessary analysis of upstream and downstream GHG effects, expands categorical exclusions for low-impact projects, and shortens the maximum deadline for EIS completion from three years to two.
- See: Revision of National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures (July 3 2025)

4. DOE canceled billions of dollars in funding for wind and solar projects approved under the previous administration.
- See: DOE Announces Termination of 223 Projects Saving Over $7.5 Billion (Energy.gov)

5. DOE terminated $3.7 billion in carbon-capture and decarbonization grants previously approved under Biden, 16 of the 24 projects were signed between Election Day and Inauguration Day. These cancellations signal DOE's shift away from politicized spending toward cost-effective energy innovation.
- See: Utility Dive – DOE Cancels $3.7B in Carbon Capture and Decarbonization Awards (Feb 2025) and WSJ – Energy Department to Slash Nearly $24 Billion in Green Project Funding (Mar 2025)

6. Secretary Wright created the Climate Working Group, which produced A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate.
- See: DOE Climate Working Group Report (July 2025)

7. Wright ordered the National Petroleum Council to deliver a "Future Energy Systems" study focused on bolstering oil and gas development by identifying pipeline needs and recommending permitting and regulatory reforms to expand and expedite production and delivery.
- See: Powering the Future: Secretary Wright Calls on NPC for Energy Study (Sep 22 2025)

8. DOE fast-tracked approvals for multiple LNG projects previously sidelined under Biden, streamlined permitting requirements, and extended operating authorizations for other LNG export facilities.
- See: Secretary Wright Issues First LNG Export Approval (2/14/25) and DOE Issues Extension for Delfin LNG Project (3/10/25)

9. DOE has canceled hundreds of millions in electric-vehicle and battery-manufacturing grants, including funds for EV charger networks, battery plants, and start-up manufacturers — a broader rollback of politically driven subsidies in favor of market-based investment.
- See: DOE Cancels More Than $700 Million in Battery Manufacturing Projects (E&E News, Oct. 20 2025)

10. DOE is advancing small modular reactor (SMR) development through partnerships with national laboratories and universities, including new funding for research at Idaho National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Purdue University. In April 2025, DOE announced up to $900 million to accelerate U.S.-made SMR deployment.
- See: DOE Announces $900 Million to Unlock Commercial Deployment of American-Made SMRs (Apr 2025) ❐

Ford Pulls its EV Trucks (Cont.)

everything "green."

Bloomberg News just estimated that the world has spent about $10 trillion on emissions reduction efforts in the 10 years since the Paris Climate Accord was signed in 2015. During that time, emissions have increased to record levels with the rate of increase four times higher than the 2010s, according to the most recent United Nations Emissions Gap Report. So that's $10 trillion that accomplished nothing.

As to the latter "accomplished nothing" point, meteorologist Joe Bastardi released a preliminary estimate this week to underscore what that means. Bastardi says that in the part of the globe where 99.8% of the world's population lives – i.e., between 60 degrees north latitude and 60 degrees south latitude – there has only been 0.18 degrees Fahrenheit of warming over the average temperature for the 30 years between 1991-2020.

Not only is that not a measurable or perceptible amount of warming, it is hardly worth the extra cost of EVs, "green electricity" or the $10 trillion wasted on climate. ❐

Paris Climate Deal Now Decade-Old Disaster

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

The Paris Climate Accord was adopted 10 years ago this week. It's been a decade of disaster that President Donald Trump is rightly trying again to end.

The stated purpose of the agreement was for countries to voluntarily cut emissions to avoid the average global temperature exceeding the (guessed at) pre-industrial temperature by 3.6°F (2°C) and preferably 2.7°F (1.5°C).out looking at the other three.

Since December 2015, the world spent an estimated $10 trillion trying to achieve the Paris goals. What has been accomplished? Instead of reducing global emissions, they have increased about 12 percent. While the increase in emissions is actually a good thing for the environment and humanity, spending $10 trillion in a failed effort to cut emissions just underscores the agreement's waste, fraud and abuse.

But wasting $10 trillion is only the tip of the iceberg.

The effort to cut emissions was largely based on forcing industrial countries to replace their tried-and-true fossil fuel-based energy systems with not-ready-for-prime-time wind, solar and battery-based systems. This forced transition has driven up energy costs and made energy systems less reliable. The result of that has been economy-crippling deindustrialization in former powerhouses of Germany and Britain.

And it gets worse.

European nations imagined they could reduce their carbon footprint by outsourcing their coal and natural gas needs to Russia. That outsourcing enriched Russia and made the European economy dependent on Russia for energy. That vulnerability, in turn, and a weak President Joe Biden encouraged Vladimir Putin to invade Ukraine.

The result of that has been more than one million killed and wounded, the mass destruction of Ukraine worth more than $500 billion so far and the inestimable cost of global destabilization. Europe will have to spend hundreds of billions more on defense, and U.S. taxpayers have been forced to spend hundreds of billions on arms for Ukraine. Putin has even raised the specter of using nuclear weapons.

President Barack Obama unconstitutionally tried to impose the Paris agreement on the U.S. as an Executive agreement rather than a treaty ratified by the U.S. Senate. Although Trump terminated the Executive agreement during his first administration, President Joe Biden rejoined the agreement soon after taking office, pledging to double Obama's emissions cuts pledge to 50 percent below 2005 levels by 2030.

Biden's emissions pledge was an impetus for the 2022 Inflation Reduction Act that allocated $1.2 trillion in spending for what Trump labeled as the Green New Scam. Although Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill Act reduced that spending by about $500 billion and he is trying to reduce it further through Executive action, much of that money was used in an effort to buy the 2024 election for Democrats. The rest has been and will be used to wreck our electricity grid with dangerous, national security-compromising wind, solar and battery equipment from Communists China.

Then there's this. At the Paris climate conference in 2015, US Secretary of State John Kerry stated quite clearly that emissions cuts by the U.S. and other industrial countries were meaningless and would accomplish nothing since the developing world's emissions would be increasing.

Finally, there is the climate realism aspect to all this. After the Paris agreement was signed and despite the increase in emissions, the average global temperature declined during the years from 2016 to 2022, per NOAA data.

The super El Nino experienced during 2023-2024 caused a temporary temperature spike. La Nina conditions have now returned the average global temperature to below the 2015-2016 level, per NASA satellite data. The overarching point is that any "global warming" that occurred over the past 40 years is actually associated with the natural El Nino-La Nina cycle, not emissions.

The Paris agreement has been all pain and no gain. Moreover, there was never any need for the agreement in the first place. A big thanks to President Trump for pulling us out again. ❐

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