

July 2005



# ExxonMobil Exposed



**More Drilling,  
More Global Warming,  
More Oil Dependence**

**EXPOSE EXXON**

# ExxonMobil Exposed:

More Drilling, More Global Warming,  
More Oil Dependence

July 2005



---

## Acknowledgements

Written by Alison Cassady, Research Director at the U.S. PIRG Education Fund, for the Exxpose Exxon campaign.

© Exxpose Exxon, 2005

Cover photo of Arctic Refuge courtesy of Subhankar Banerjee, [www.wwbphoto.com](http://www.wwbphoto.com). Cover photo of oil-covered bird courtesy of Pedro Armestre/Greenpeace; cover photo of polar bears courtesy of Daniel Beltra/Greenpeace; cover photo of Granite Point oil platform, Cook Inlet, Alaska, courtesy of Robert Visser/Greenpeace.

The Exxpose Exxon campaign is a collaborative effort of several of the nation's largest environmental and public interest advocacy organizations to activate and educate the public about ExxonMobil, the world's largest and most irresponsible oil company. For more information about the organizations participating in the campaign, visit the campaign's website at [www.ExxposeExxon.com](http://www.ExxposeExxon.com).

---

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	4
<b>Introduction</b> .....	6
<b>Blocking Action on Global Warming</b> .....	6
ExxonMobil Contributes to Global Warming .....	7
ExxonMobil Denies that Global Warming Exists .....	7
ExxonMobil Funds Junk Science on Global Warming .....	8
ExxonMobil Hinders Action on Global Warming .....	11
<b>Lobbying to Drill in the Arctic Refuge</b> .....	13
<b>Profiting from Oil Dependence, Ignoring Renewable Energy Sources</b> .....	14
ExxonMobil Profits from Oil Dependence .....	14
ExxonMobil Rejects Investment in Renewables .....	14
<b>Failing to Pay All Damages for the <i>Exxon Valdez</i> Oil Spill</b> .....	15
<b>Pushing Its Agenda on Capitol Hill</b> .....	16
<b>Moving the Country Forward</b> .....	17
Fuel Economy .....	17
Renewable Energy .....	17
Energy Efficiency .....	17
ExxonMobil: An Obstacle to a Cleaner Energy Future .....	18
<b>Conclusion and Recommendations</b> .....	18
<b>Notes</b> .....	19

---

## Executive Summary

We stand at a crossroads on energy policy in the United States. Our dependence on oil is costing consumers at the pump, draining the economy, endangering our national security, and polluting the environment. For better or worse, the decisions our elected officials and business leaders make to address this problem will have repercussions not only at home but worldwide.

The United States is simply too dependent on oil. The United States holds only two percent of the world's oil reserves but consumes 25 percent of the world's total petroleum production.<sup>1</sup> Oil pollutes the environment from the point of extraction to combustion, leaving a trail of oil spills, smog-forming air pollution, and global warming in its wake. Consumers also pay a price in the form of unpredictably high gasoline prices at the pump while oil companies are earning record profits.

Unfortunately, U.S. policy-makers have responded not with a plan to lead our country away from oil dependence but with more of the same. The Bush administration and its allies in Congress have rejected efforts to cap global warming pollution and make a significant investment in renewable energy technology. They have called for oil and gas drilling in pristine places such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. At the same time, they have rejected efforts to make cars go farther on a gallon of gas—an efficiency measure that would reduce our dependence on oil while saving consumers money at the pump.

ExxonMobil, the world's largest oil company, has not only echoed these short-sighted policy decisions but led the charge to craft and implement them. In contrast to many of its peers in the oil industry, ExxonMobil has acted consistently to move our country backward, not forward, on energy policy.

- ExxonMobil is still actively pushing to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling.

- ExxonMobil continues to deny the urgency of global warming, fund junk science to cloud the issue, and actively inhibit domestic and international efforts to cut global warming pollution.

- ExxonMobil is making record-breaking profits because of high gasoline prices but refuses to invest that windfall in renewable energy to ease America's oil dependence.

- ExxonMobil continues to challenge the 1994 court ruling ordering the company to pay \$4-\$5 billion in punitive damages to fishermen and others injured by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.

In ExxonMobil's ideal world, the U.S. and other countries would use more and more oil, not less, allowing the company to collect even higher profits in the short term. Automakers would continue to produce gas-guzzling cars despite advances in fuel-efficient vehicles. The U.S. and other countries would relax their environmental rules to allow the company to drill to the ends of the Earth, even in our most precious places. In ExxonMobil's ideal world, the U.S. and the rest of the world would ignore global warming science and continue to let global warming pollution climb precipitously.

ExxonMobil has the power to wreak significant damage on the world's environment, but it also has the power to direct the oil industry and American decision-makers toward a new energy future. The "Exxpose Exxon" campaign is calling on ExxonMobil to:

- Commit to not drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and pull out of Arctic Power, the single issue lobbying group dedicated to drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

- Support mandatory caps on global warming pollution and stop funding junk science to obscure the facts about global warming.

- Save consumers money at the pump and ease our oil dependence by investing in renewable energy and energy efficiency and supporting stronger fuel economy standards to make cars go farther on a gallon of gasoline.

- Pay all of the punitive damages awarded in 1994 to fishermen and others injured by the 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.

As the world's largest and most profitable oil company, ExxonMobil should shed its past as an irresponsible oil company and move forward as a responsible energy company—one committed to more than drilling to the last drop.

---

## Introduction

On March 24, 1989, the oil tanker *Exxon Valdez*, carrying more than 50 million gallons of North Slope crude oil, ran aground and ruptured in Alaska's Prince William Sound. Approximately 11 million gallons of crude oil poured into the Prince William Sound in less than five hours. By August 1989, the oil had moved across nearly 10,000 square miles of water in Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska. The amount of spilled oil is roughly equivalent to 125 Olympic-sized swimming pools.<sup>2</sup>

In the 16 years since this infamous oil spill, ExxonMobil has done little to improve its reputation. As detailed in the pages that follow, ExxonMobil has hindered action to fight global warming, continues to lobby to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling, and is reaping the financial benefits of America's

dependence on oil at the expense of working families and small businesses—but refuses to invest in renewable energy or support stronger fuel economy standards to make cars go farther on a gallon of gasoline.

As the largest independent energy company in the world, ExxonMobil's decisions can affect the rest of the industry over the long term. With daily production of more than four million barrels of oil and gas, ExxonMobil pumps more crude than Kuwait. In the words of Art Smith, who heads up John S. Herold Inc., an independent energy-consulting firm, "Exxon sets the standard" for the oil industry.<sup>3</sup> The "Exxpose Exxon" campaign calls on ExxonMobil to use its leadership position to steer the energy industry toward a more sustainable future.

---

## Blocking Action on Global Warming

Global temperatures are climbing, the Arctic ice cap is melting, sea levels are rising, and we now know that heat-trapping pollution from burning oil and other fossil fuels is primarily responsible for these disturbing trends.

Global warming is caused by the buildup of carbon dioxide and other pollutants in the Earth's atmosphere that trap heat. Although carbon dioxide is naturally present in the atmosphere, burning fossil fuels in cars, power plants, factories and buildings is now emitting this gas about twice as fast as it can be removed by natural processes. As a result, the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide has increased by more than 30 percent since the time oil was first produced on a commercial scale. Concentrations of other heat-trapping ("greenhouse") gases have increased as well.

These atmospheric changes mean less of the sun's heat escapes the Earth's atmosphere, causing the Earth's temperature to rise. Global average temperatures increased during the 20th century by more than 0.6° C (1° F), with the rate of change for the period since 1976 roughly three times that for the past 100 years as a whole.<sup>4</sup> According to the United Nations' World Meteorological Organization, 2004 was the fourth hottest year ever recorded, and the 1990s were the warmest decade since measurements began in 1861.<sup>5</sup> If current trends continue, temperatures will rise by an additional 1.4° C to 5.8° C from 1990 to 2100.<sup>6</sup>

The consequences of the increase in global temperatures will vary from place to place because the Earth's climate is extraordinarily complex. According to the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

(IPCC), the most authoritative source on global warming, the changes that could occur include sea level rise of up to three feet by 2100; heat waves; drought; increasingly intense tropical storms; loss of plant and animal species; decreased crop yields; decreased water availability; and the spread of infectious diseases.<sup>7</sup>

The first signs of global warming are already evident in the U.S. and worldwide. For instance, the Arctic Council and International Arctic Science Committee released the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment in November 2004, warning that the Arctic is warming rapidly and that this warming threatens to push Arctic species toward extinction.<sup>8</sup> In Montana's Glacier National Park, the largest glaciers are only about one-third the size they were in 1850, and many small mountain glaciers have disappeared completely. The area of the park covered by glaciers declined by 73 percent from 1850 to 1993, and scientists estimate that the park's glaciers will disappear entirely by 2030. Meanwhile, average summer temperatures in the park have increased by about 1.8° F since 1900.<sup>9</sup>

Although it is a large contributor to the global warming problem, ExxonMobil continues to deny the existence of global warming, fund junk research to cast doubt on the broad scientific consensus on the problem, and directly undermine efforts to reduce global warming pollution.

### ExxonMobil Contributes to Global Warming

According to a report by Friends of the Earth International, between 1882 and 2002, ExxonMobil's operations and the burning of its products released an estimated 20.3 billion tons of carbon – or about five percent of global carbon dioxide emissions. Moreover, ExxonMobil's emissions alone have contributed more than three percent of total attributable temperature change since 1882 and two percent of the sea level rise.<sup>10</sup>

### ExxonMobil Denies that Global Warming Exists

Despite broad international scientific consensus and statements by other oil companies to the contrary, ExxonMobil continues to deny that humans are having an effect on the climate.

Climate experts are nearly unanimous in their calls for immediate action to cut manmade global warming pollution. Scientists from all over the world have written dozens of papers documenting the problem.<sup>11</sup> In June 2005, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences joined similar groups from 10 other nations in a call for prompt action to reduce global warming pollution, warning that delays will be costly.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, more than 1,000 scientists from across the U.S. signed a letter to the U.S. Senate outlining the consensus on the anthropogenic component of global warming.<sup>13</sup>

In contrast, in its statement of policy on global warming, ExxonMobil claims that the “nature and causes of climate change are still debated.”<sup>14</sup> In 2000, the company's literature on global warming stated “science is not now able to confirm that fossil fuel use has led to any significant global warming.”<sup>15</sup> In 2002, Lee Raymond, Chairman and CEO of ExxonMobil, said “we in ExxonMobil do not believe that the science required to establish this linkage between fossil fuels and warming has been demonstrated - and many scientists agree.”<sup>16</sup> In March 2002, Mr. Raymond said that the corporation intends to “stay the course” in its skepticism regarding global warming “until someone comes along with new information.”<sup>17</sup> Similarly, the company has published several opinion pieces calling for additional research to address alleged uncertainties in global warming science that “limit our current ability to know the extent to which humans are affecting climate and to predict future changes caused by both human and natural forces.”<sup>18</sup> Most recently, in June 2005, Raymond told the *Wall Street Journal* that it is his view that

“it’s yet to be shown how much of this is really related to the activities of man.”<sup>19</sup>

Other oil companies have acknowledged the link between the burning of their products and global warming. BP’s corporate policy recognizes the “emerging consensus that climate change is, at least in part, linked to the production and consumption of carbon based fuels. As a major supplier of these fuels it’s only right that we play a part in finding and implementing solutions to one of the greatest challenges of this century.”<sup>20</sup> ChevronTexaco notes that “the use of fossil fuels to meet the world’s energy needs has contributed to an increase in greenhouse gases (GHGs) – mainly carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and methane – in the Earth’s atmosphere. There is a widespread view that this increase is leading to climate change, with adverse effects on the environment.”<sup>21</sup> ConocoPhillips also “recognizes that human activity, including the burning of fossil fuels, is contributing to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that can lead to adverse changes in global climate.”<sup>22</sup> For its part, the “Royal Dutch/Shell Group of Companies shares the widespread concern that the emission of greenhouse gases (GHG) from human activities is leading to changes in the global climate.”<sup>23</sup>

Although each of these oil companies can do much more to cut global warming pollution, they are several steps ahead of ExxonMobil, which simply denies its role in the problem. In early 2003, Trillium Asset Management examined activities of the major oil companies in order to compare the thoroughness of disclosure and corporate readiness for global warming-related developments. Trillium analyzed and ranked companies for quality of governance, measurement of global warming pollution, targets for emissions reductions, emissions reduction activity, and active involvement in constructive policy discussion. According to this analysis, ExxonMobil lags far behind the other major oil companies.<sup>24</sup>

## ExxonMobil Funds Junk Science on Global Warming

ExxonMobil’s position on global warming has not solely been one of denial, however. ExxonMobil has been funding many of the efforts designed to cast doubt on the overwhelming evidence linking human activities and global warming. Greenpeace has identified about 40 ExxonMobil-funded organizations that either have sought to undermine mainstream scientific findings on global warming or have affiliated with a small group of climate “naysayers” who continue to do so.<sup>25</sup> In 2004, ExxonMobil gave \$1.9 million to 26 organizations specifically to challenge the scientific consensus on global warming; this is more than double the amount given to organizations in 2003 for grants earmarked for global warming work (\$905,000).<sup>26</sup> Between 1998 and 2004, ExxonMobil gave more than \$15 million to organizations working to influence global warming policy.<sup>27</sup> Many of the recipients of funding earmarked for work on global warming are members of the Cooler Heads Coalition, formed in 1997 “to dispel the myths of global warming by exposing flawed economic, scientific, and risk analysis.”<sup>28</sup>

Talking about corporate-funded anti-global warming research, Myron Ebell of the Competitive Enterprise Institute has stated that many corporations have funded “drips and drabs here and there, but I would be surprised to learn that there was a bigger one than Exxon.”<sup>29</sup> ExxonMobil CEO Lee Raymond downplays the importance of the money the company spends on global warming “naysayers,” arguing that “you don’t have to spend a lot of money to aggravate the proponents.”<sup>30</sup>

The following are a few examples of the company’s contributions in 2003 and 2004 to public policy organizations working to counter efforts to regulate global warming pollution. See [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org) for more examples:<sup>31</sup>

**The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition (TASSC)**, \$10,000 in both 2003 and 2004. TASSC is a supposedly inactive “national coalition intended to educate the media, public officials and the public about the dangers of ‘junk science.’” Phillip Morris covertly created this organization in the 1990s to generate scientific controversy regarding the link between secondhand smoke and cancer. Steven Milloy, who describes himself as an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, became executive director of TASSC in 1997 after lobbying for the tobacco industry.<sup>32</sup> Milloy now devotes his time to [www.junkscience.com](http://www.junkscience.com), which features ongoing analysis of the global warming “hoax,” including a running calculator of how much the Kyoto Protocol has cost the U.S. since going into effect worldwide. JunkScience.com is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>33</sup>

**American Legislative Exchange Council**, \$290,000 in 2003 and \$222,000 in 2004. The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) promotes the “principles of free markets, limited government, federalism and individual liberty among America's state legislators.”<sup>34</sup> To accomplish this mission, ALEC organizes various task forces, pairing industry lobbyists who “pay to play” with state legislators from around the country. Their goal is to work together to draft, introduce, and enact model legislation that is favorable to industry. The Natural Resources Task Force has crafted legislation rejecting carbon dioxide emission reductions, and ALEC staffers frequently write on why global warming is not a problem and how policies to reduce global warming pollution will devastate the economy.<sup>35</sup> ALEC is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>36</sup>

**Annapolis Center for Science-Based Public Policy**, \$102,500 in 2003 and \$75,000 in 2004. The Annapolis Center has written several papers on global warming, questioning the science behind conclusions that humans are contributing to the problem.<sup>37</sup>

**Capital Research Center, Green Watch Project**, \$25,000 in 2003 and 2004. Green Watch is an “on-line database and information clearinghouse providing factual information on over 500 non-profit environmental groups;” it also “produces timely news reports and analyses of the environmental movement.”<sup>38</sup> These news reports and analyses often include studies questioning the validity of global warming science and equating caps on carbon pollution with a massive tax increase.<sup>39</sup>

**Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise**, \$40,000 in 2003 and \$130,000 in 2004. The Center describes itself as an “educational foundation for individual liberty, free markets, property rights and limited government.”<sup>40</sup> The Center’s website includes a variety of articles aiming to discredit environmental organizations as well as global warming science. In one article referenced, the author dismisses fear about global warming as a “religious belief.”<sup>41</sup> Paul Driessen, a senior policy analyst for the Center, stated in December of 2004 that advocates of caps on global warming pollution “threaten to disrupt our global economy, technology, health and prosperity, to ‘safeguard’ us from a ‘risk’ that is no more real than Tyrannosaurus rex bursting out of a lump of Cretaceous amber.”<sup>42</sup>

**Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT)**, \$72,000 in 2003 and \$125,000 in 2004. CFACT has written several articles attempting to cast doubt on global warming science. In one piece, Paul Driessen (also of the Center for Defense of Free Enterprise) calls proponents of curbing global warming pollution “ethically and socially irresponsible,” arguing that policies to cap emissions would deprive poor people of electricity.<sup>43</sup> CFACT is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>44</sup>

**Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI)**, \$440,000 in 2003 and \$270,000 in 2004. CEI bills itself as a “leader in the fight against the global warming scare.” CEI argues that “predictions of the extent of future warming are

based on implausible scientific and economic assumptions, and the negative impacts of predicted warming have been vastly exaggerated.”<sup>45</sup> Myron Ebell, who oversees all global warming and international environmental work at CEI, chairs the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>46</sup>

**Consumer Alert**, \$15,000 in 2003 and \$25,000 in 2004. Consumer Alert promotes the “consumer value of a market economy” and publishes editorials, articles, and other papers on numerous issues, including global warming.<sup>47</sup> One of its global warming articles is entitled “Global Warming Hotheads Use Anything to Justify their Theory.”<sup>48</sup> Consumer Alert started the National Consumer Coalition in 1996 as an “on-going coalition of market-oriented national and state-level policy and activist groups.” In 1997, a sub-group of this coalition formed the Cooler Heads Coalition “to dispel the myths of global warming by exposing flawed economic, scientific, and risk analysis.”<sup>49</sup>

**George C. Marshall Institute**, \$95,000 in 2003 and \$170,000 in 2004. In a December 2004 paper on global warming, the Institute wrote that there is no “robust scientific basis for drawing definitive and objective conclusions about the extent of human influence and future climate.”<sup>50</sup> The Institute is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>51</sup>

**International Policy Network**, \$50,000 in 2003 and \$115,000 in 2004. ExxonMobil funds the International Policy Network (IPN) to conduct global warming outreach. IPN explains that it has engaged in the debate on global warming “because of a concern that scientifically dubious and economically illiterate claims are being used to justify policies” to regulate global warming pollution.<sup>52</sup> IPN co-authored a report arguing that policies to reduce carbon pollution would “perpetuate poverty, making it more difficult for the poor to adapt” to the potential effects of global warming.<sup>53</sup>

**National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA)**, \$75,000 in 2003 and 2004. NCPA claims that the causes of global warming remain unknown and debate whether humans are part of the problem.<sup>54</sup> NCPA is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>55</sup>

**National Center for Public Policy Research (NCPFR)**, \$55,000 in 2003 and 2004. ExxonMobil gave NCPFR \$55,000 in both 2003 and 2004, in part funding the EnviroTruth website. The EnviroTruth website outlines the “myths and misunderstandings surrounding the topic of climate change.” The first myth is that humans are causing global warming.<sup>56</sup> NCPFR is a member of the Cooler Heads Coalition.<sup>57</sup>

Frank O’Donnell of Clean Air Watch likens ExxonMobil’s strategy to that of “a football quarterback who doesn’t want to throw to one receiver, but rather wants to spread it around to a number of different receivers.”<sup>58</sup> ExxonMobil’s diverse funding of think tanks and quasi-media outlets helps to generate an echo effect, where often baseless attacks on global warming science create the appearance of scientific controversy.

The industry response to the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), released in November 2004, stands as a stark example of this echo effect.<sup>59</sup> Compiled by some 300 scientists, the ACIA study warned that the Arctic is warming rapidly and that this warming threatens to push Arctic species toward extinction.<sup>60</sup> Several think tanks and other institutions funded by ExxonMobil responded within hours to debunk this report, researched over four years. Steven Milloy, who receives funding from ExxonMobil and is an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, wrote a column for FoxNews.com called “Polar Bear Scare on Thin Ice.”<sup>61</sup> James McCarthy, a Harvard biological oceanographer and a lead author of the ACIA report, dismissed Milloy’s column as contradicting hundreds of scientific papers. Nevertheless, several other

Exxon-funded groups echoed Milloy's assertions. TechCentralStation.com (which received \$95,000 from ExxonMobil in 2003) published a letter to Senator John McCain (AZ) from 11 "climate experts" challenging ACIA's conclusions. Before a Senate hearing on the ACIA report, the George C. Marshall Institute issued a press release asserting that the Arctic report was based on "unvalidated climate models and scenarios."<sup>62</sup> The Vancouver-based Fraser Institute (which received \$60,000 from ExxonMobil in 2003 and 2004) called the ACIA report "an excellent example of the favoured scare technique of the anti-energy activists...."<sup>63</sup> This flurry of activity created the perception of a scientific debate, even though the critics comprised a small minority of voices and lacked the scientific rigor of the exhaustively reviewed ACIA report.

## ExxonMobil Hinders Action on Global Warming

Ever since global warming emerged on the international agenda, ExxonMobil has been there to hinder or even derail the negotiation process.<sup>64</sup>

### Launching the Global Climate Coalition

Exxon, Mobil, and other large companies with a financial stake in fossil fuels launched the Global Climate Coalition (GCC) in 1989 with the goal of casting doubt on the science behind global warming, sounding alarms about the catastrophic consequences of regulating carbon dioxide emissions, and influencing the ongoing international negotiations on global warming issues. For example, in February 1992, the GCC held a press conference with global warming "skeptics" to attack IPCC's science during the fifth session of negotiations. The GCC also issued a briefing entitled "Stabilizing carbon dioxide emissions would have little environmental benefit."<sup>65</sup>

By 1997, however, the growing scientific and public consensus regarding global warming forced a number of member companies to reconsider their GCC membership from a public relations perspective. BP withdrew from GCC in 1997 after BP's chief executive admitted that the "time to consider the policy dimensions of climate change is not when the link between greenhouse gases and climate change is conclusively proven but when the possibility cannot be discounted and is taken seriously by the society of which we are part. We in BP have reached that point."<sup>66</sup> Other prominent companies, including Shell, Texaco, Ford, General Motors, and DaimlerChrysler, followed suit shortly thereafter.<sup>67</sup>

The GCC officially disbanded in early 2002, although ExxonMobil remained involved until the bitter end; the coalition's website claims that the "industry voice on climate change has served its purpose by contributing to a new national approach to global warming."<sup>68</sup>

### Hindering International Negotiations

In April 1998, Exxon helped plan a \$6 million industry public relations offensive, the American Petroleum Institute's (API) *Global Climate Science Communications Action Plan*, which aimed to cast doubt on global warming science leading up to a new round of international negotiations in Buenos Aires that November. The petroleum industry's strategy was to offer "a complete scientific critique of the IPCC research and its conclusions" by recruiting and training five "independent" scientists – "new faces... without a long history of visibility in the climate debate" to participate in media outreach.<sup>69</sup> Myron Ebell of the Competitive Enterprise Institute says the plan was never implemented because "the envisioned funding never got close to being realized." ExxonMobil continues to fund several of the key players who helped develop the API plan.<sup>70</sup>

ExxonMobil also has tried to directly influence the decisions and even the makeup of the IPCC.

During the final drafting of the IPCC's First Scientific Assessment Report in 1990, for example, Exxon disputed IPCC's conclusion that 60 to 80 percent cuts in carbon dioxide emissions would be needed to stabilize the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, arguing that "uncertainties" remained about the behavior of carbon in the climate system. The company demanded that the IPCC report state that the model results were "quite scientifically uncertain." IPCC rejected the company's recommendations.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, in September 2001, the IPCC met in London to reach agreement on its Third Assessment Report on global warming. IPCC's draft final report contained the following line: "The Earth's climate system has demonstrably changed on both global and regional scales since the pre-industrial era, with some of these changes attributable to human activities." At this meeting, ExxonMobil suggested deleting the text: "*with some of these changes attributable to human activities.*" IPCC rejected the company's proposed amendment.<sup>72</sup>

In 2002, ExxonMobil wrote a confidential memo to the White House asking the administration to oppose Dr. Robert Watson as chair of the IPCC. The ExxonMobil memo, obtained by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) from the White House Council on Environmental Quality under the Freedom of Information Act, shows that ExxonMobil began campaigning for Dr. Watson's dismissal early in the Bush administration.<sup>73</sup> Dr. Watson, a highly respected atmospheric scientist, had been chair of the IPCC since 1996. Dr. Watson had been an outspoken critic of the United States for its lack of action; ExxonMobil charged that he had a personal agenda and that his real objective was to "get media coverage for his views." After the Bush administration announced its decision to oppose Dr. Watson's appointment to a second term as IPCC chair, the IPCC officials meeting in Geneva in April 2002 elected a new chair for the next five years.<sup>74</sup> The same ExxonMobil memo recommended that Harlan Watson, a Republican staffer with the House Committee on Science,

lead the United States' diplomatic efforts on global warming. Harlan Watson is now the State Department's "senior climate negotiator."<sup>75</sup>

### **Crafting U.S. Global Warming Policy**

Similarly, according to documents obtained by Greenpeace through the Freedom of Information Act, ExxonMobil has worked intimately to craft the Bush administration's global warming policies from the beginning.<sup>76</sup> In fact, ExxonMobil was the only oil company to meet with the State Department in 2001 on the subject of global warming and the Kyoto treaty. In briefing papers given to Paula Dobriansky, the U.S. undersecretary for global affairs in the State Department, the Bush administration thanks ExxonMobil executives for the company's "active involvement" and seeks its advice on which global warming policies the company might find acceptable. ExxonMobil's position has been categorical; according to the documents, the White House considered ExxonMobil "among the companies most actively and prominently opposed to binding approaches [like Kyoto] to cut greenhouse gas emissions."<sup>77</sup> For her part, Ms. Dobriansky headed the U.S. delegation to a United Nations meeting on the Kyoto Protocol in Buenos Aires, where she charged that "science tells us that we cannot say with any certainty what constitutes a dangerous level of warming, and therefore what level must be avoided."<sup>78</sup>

The Bush administration also has been diligent in crafting the message in public documents about global warming. In June 2005, Philip A. Cooney, a former lobbyist for the American Petroleum Institute and the chief of staff of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality, resigned just two days after the *New York Times* revealed he had edited government reports to cast doubt on the link between carbon dioxide pollution from fossil fuels and global warming, reflecting the oil industry's position. Just a week later, ExxonMobil hired Mr. Cooney. ExxonMobil has declined to provide details of

Cooney's new job, which he starts later in 2005.<sup>79</sup>

ExxonMobil's active campaigning against international cooperation on global warming continues, even though the Kyoto Protocol went into effect in February 2004 without the United

States. ExxonMobil spent millions of dollars on an advertising campaign aimed at influencing politicians and business leaders in the UK and other pro-Kyoto countries in the weeks before the G8 meeting in July 2005, where global warming was on the agenda.<sup>80</sup>

---

## Lobbying to Drill in the Arctic Refuge

In 1960, President Dwight Eisenhower established the Arctic National Wildlife Range in recognition of the area's unparalleled scenic, wildlife and recreational values. In 1980, Congress renamed the Range as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and enlarged the Refuge to 19 million acres. Most of the former Range became a part of the Wilderness Preservation System. The only area not designated as wilderness was the 1.5 million acre coastal plain, which was designated as a study area at the behest of the oil and gas industry. As a study area, the coastal plain is not open to drilling, nor is it permanently protected from drilling or development.

Known as "America's Serengeti," the coastal plain supports large populations of caribou, muskoxen, three species of bear (brown, black and polar), gray wolves, Dall sheep, and thousands of migratory birds. The annual migration of the 129,000-member Porcupine caribou herd evokes images of the long-gone buffalo herds of the Great Plains. The Arctic Refuge also is the most consistently used polar bear denning area on American soil.

In 1992, the four major oil corporations operating on Alaska's North Slope in the National

Petroleum Reserve—BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, and ChevronTexaco—joined together with the state of Alaska to create Arctic Power, a single-issue lobbying organization dedicated to drilling in the Arctic Refuge.<sup>81</sup> In the last few years, three of the four companies (all but ExxonMobil) have dropped out of Arctic Power following shareholder resolutions and grassroots campaigns calling on the companies to pull their support for the lobbying group.

ExxonMobil has been public about its support for opening up the Arctic Refuge to drilling. In February 2001, for example, ExxonMobil published an opinion piece in which it stated its principles: "energy is important, explore more broadly, do it very carefully, find out what's there. And it is in the nation's interest to apply this approach to [the Arctic Refuge]."<sup>82</sup> In a March 2004 speech, ExxonMobil President Rex Tillerson argued that the U.S. will remain dependent on oil throughout the next century. As such, he stated that we need "to allow further development of the energy resources to be found right here in the United States. This includes those that may be offshore California and Florida, in the Rocky Mountains and in northern Alaska."<sup>83</sup>

---

# Profiting from Oil Dependence, Ignoring Renewable Energy Sources

## ExxonMobil Profits from Oil Dependence

Consumers pay the price for our oil dependence. Gasoline prices are sensitive to even the threat of crude oil supply disruptions; moreover, as oil demand increases, so does the price of a gallon of gasoline. Gasoline averaged more than \$2.10 per gallon during the first half of 2005.<sup>84</sup> Rising gas prices are cutting into consumer and business confidence, as well as spending power, which helped slow the U.S. economy in the first quarter of 2005.<sup>85</sup>

ExxonMobil and other oil industry giants are reaping the benefits of high gasoline prices. According to its 2004 annual report, ExxonMobil earned a record-breaking \$25.3 billion in net income in 2004, a \$3.8 billion increase over 2003 and a \$13.9 billion increase over 2002. Cash flow from operations and asset sales was \$43.3 billion, also a record. In addition, the company handed out nearly \$15 billion to shareholders in dividends and share buybacks.<sup>86</sup> During the first quarter of 2005, ExxonMobil recorded net income of \$7.86 billion, a \$2.4 billion increase from the first quarter of 2004.<sup>87</sup> During the year ending December 31, 2004, CEO Lee Raymond earned about \$38 million, including \$7.5 million in salary and bonus plus restricted stock worth \$28 million and nearly \$2.6 million more in other compensation and incentives. This is a 36 percent increase from his 2003 compensation package of about \$28 million.<sup>88</sup>

## ExxonMobil Rejects Investment in Renewables

Lee Raymond is now facing the challenge of how to spend the windfall wrought by oil hovering

around \$55-a-barrel.<sup>89</sup> Some critics say the company should spend more on exploring for and developing new sources of oil and gas. Other critics, such as Jennifer Layke of the World Resources Institute, say that ExxonMobil and others in the oil industry are missing an opportunity to use the windfall to develop alternative energy sources. Given the risk from global warming and potential regulation, “diversification is a clear first step to protect their own businesses.”<sup>90</sup>

ExxonMobil is unlikely to invest in developing alternative energy sources any time soon, given numerous public statements about challenges posed by alternatives energy sources “that cannot and should not be submerged in easy rhetoric about a post-petroleum world.”<sup>91</sup> The company estimates that solar and wind energy demand will grow at a 10 percent rate annually over the next 25 years, but only because of government subsidies and tax breaks to spur investment in cleaner energy sources. ExxonMobil has called this an “uneconomic niche,” noting that the company’s business “is not built around the expectation of a bunch of subsidies to make a profit.”<sup>92</sup> Notably, between 1950 and 1997, the oil and gas industry received more than \$350 billion in federal subsidies, or 60 percent of all federal energy subsidies.<sup>93</sup>

In addition, company policy assumes that continued oil dependence is a given. In a March 2005 speech, Rex Tillerson, President of ExxonMobil and a likely candidate to replace Lee Raymond as CEO when he retires, stated that the company assumes that America will continue to remain dependent on oil—especially foreign oil from the Middle East. He argued that we “need to accept the reality of this rather than undertake

expensive and risky steps trying to avoid it.” Tillerson proposed that the “key to managing the risks for America’s and the world’s energy future is to broaden the base of geographic locations from which we get our oil and gas,” rather than reduce consumption of oil and gas.<sup>94</sup> Simply, ExxonMobil has no plans to move beyond petroleum and natural gas, positioning the company to continue to profit in the short term from burgeoning demand and price increases.

ExxonMobil is quick to point to its pledge to spend \$10 million a year for 10 years on the Global Climate and Energy Project (GCEP) at Stanford University for research into breakthrough “mega-technologies,” such as capturing carbon dioxide after it is emitted and burying it deep underground. The company’s \$100 million commitment, however, represents just two days of its 2004 profits and is dwarfed by ExxonMobil’s annual expenditures for oil and gas exploration, totaling more than \$1 billion in 2004 alone.<sup>95</sup>

Moreover, ExxonMobil’s involvement in the Stanford project is unlikely to result in reductions in global warming pollution in the near term. In a story by the *Associated Press*, Frank Sprow, the company’s vice president of safety, health, and environment, called GCEP “a program that is completely detached from climate science.”<sup>96</sup> Moreover, the Stanford project includes no goals,

no actual reductions, and no commitment from ExxonMobil to use any of the energy sources that will be researched.

In contrast, Shell has spent about \$1.5 billion since 1999 building a business in renewable energy, mostly solar and wind power.<sup>97</sup> In 2002, Shell Solar became one of the largest solar photovoltaic businesses in the world; to date, Shell Solar has supplied solar cells and modules with a total peak capacity of at least 350 megawatts (MW), approximately one-fifth of the installed capacity worldwide.<sup>98</sup> In June 2005, Shell Solar announced that it will help build the world’s largest single connected solar plant in Germany with the capacity to deliver electricity to almost 3,300 households annually.<sup>99</sup> In addition, Shell operates nine wind farms, including six in the U.S., one in the UK, one in Germany and one in Spain.<sup>100</sup>

Similarly, BP has spent about \$500 million on solar since 2000 and about \$30 million on wind over the past three years.<sup>101</sup> Last year, BP announced that it plans to more than double its solar capacity from 90MW to around 200MW by 2006. In 2004, BP and ChevronTexaco’s jointly owned 22.5 megawatt wind farm near Rotterdam in The Netherlands completed its first full year of commercial operation, powering 20,000 average Dutch homes and displacing 20,000 tons of carbon dioxide.<sup>102</sup>

---

## Failing to Pay All Damages for the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill

On March 24, 1989, the oil tanker *Exxon Valdez*, carrying more than 50 million gallons of North Slope crude oil, ran aground and ruptured in Alaska’s Prince William Sound. Approximately 11 million gallons of crude oil poured into the Prince William Sound in less than five hours. By August 1989, the oil had moved across nearly 10,000 square miles of water in Prince William

Sound and the Gulf of Alaska. The amount of spilled oil is roughly equivalent to 125 Olympic-sized swimming pools.<sup>103</sup>

ExxonMobil paid \$300 million immediately to more than 11,000 Alaskans and businesses affected by the *Exxon Valdez* spill. In addition, the company paid \$2.2 billion to clean up Prince

William Sound and \$1 billion in settlements with the state and federal governments.<sup>104</sup> ExxonMobil, however, is still appealing a 1994 court ruling ordering Exxon to pay \$4-\$5 billion in punitive damages to fishermen, Alaskan Natives, and others injured by the oil spill. The company argues that the “environment in Prince William Sound is healthy, robust and thriving.”<sup>105</sup>

Others disagree that Prince William Sound has recovered from the *Valdez* oil spill. In 2003, the journal *Science* printed a study concluding that wildlife in Prince William Sound has suffered longer-term effects. In particular, the authors note that toxic oil has persisted in the Alaskan coastal ecosystem; this chronic exposure to oil

has increased wildlife mortality and slowed the recovery rate for many species most affected by the 1989 spill.<sup>106</sup>

Similarly, in 2002, the *Exxon Valdez* Trustee Council (formed to oversee restoration of the injured ecosystem) reported that populations of six different animals—the common loon, cormorants (three species), harbor seal, harlequin duck, pacific herring, and pigeon guillemot—had shown little or no improvement since the spill injuries occurred. In addition, the Council concluded that as of 2002 “residents, fishermen, and the tourism/recreation industry have not fully recovered” from the oil spill.<sup>107</sup>

---

## Pushing Its Agenda on Capitol Hill

Although it has refused to pay all of the fisherman and others harmed by the *Exxon Valdez* spill, ExxonMobil has spent millions over the last five years to push its agenda on global warming, Arctic Refuge drilling, and other environmental issues.

ExxonMobil’s political action committee (PAC) and ExxonMobil employees gave \$8.3 million in campaign contributions to federal candidates and political parties between 1990 and 2004, including \$250,000 to the president’s 2004 inaugural fund.<sup>108,109</sup> Top recipients of ExxonMobil contributions since 1990 include President George W. Bush (\$117,000), Texas Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (\$70,000), Alaska Representative Don Young (\$60,000), retired Texas Senator Phil Gramm (\$58,000), and Virginia Representative Tom Davis (\$42,000).<sup>110</sup>

The company has invested the most on lobbying. Since 2000, the company has spent almost \$37 million on lobbyists to push its agenda on Capitol Hill, including \$7.7 million in 2004 alone.<sup>111</sup>

ExxonMobil has hired numerous contract lobbyists to work Capitol Hill and the Bush administration. Since 1998, this company has hired 13 firms to lobby the federal government on its behalf. It has employed 105 lobbyists itself or through a firm since 1998, of whom 27 formerly worked for Congress or the federal government.<sup>112</sup> In total, ExxonMobil spent almost \$1.5 million for contract lobbyists between 2000 and 2004.<sup>113</sup> In 2004, ExxonMobil hired Stephen Cloud of Cloud & Company LLC to lobby on global warming issues, specifically on the Climate Stewardship Act, and paid him \$80,000. Since 2000, ExxonMobil has retained O’Connor & Hannan LLP to lobby on Superfund issues, paying them \$150,000; since 2001, ExxonMobil has paid Akin Gump Strauss Hauer Feld LLP \$400,000 to lobby for expedited permitting of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48 states. Similarly, since 2000, ExxonMobil Chemical Company has paid Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman LLP \$620,000 to lobby on air quality and energy issues, including the Bush administration’s “Clear Skies” bill.

---

# Moving the Country Forward

The good news is that we already have the technological know-how to cut global warming pollution and reduce our dependence on oil while creating jobs and saving consumers money.

## Fuel Economy

The United States is the world's largest consumer of oil, with two-thirds of that oil going to fuel the transportation sector. We cannot drill our way out of this dependence; proposals to drill in places like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will do nothing to solve our energy problems. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the oil found in the Arctic Refuge would meet the energy needs of the U.S. for less than one year.<sup>114</sup>

The best way to reduce our dependence on oil and save consumers money at the pump is to make cars go farther on a gallon of gas. Today, fuel economy is at a 24-year low of 20.8 miles per gallon (mpg). The National Academy of Sciences has stated that we already have the technology to make cars get 40 mpg.<sup>115</sup> Increasing the fuel economy of our cars to 40 mpg would save at least four times as much oil each day by 2020 as the Arctic Refuge would produce each day at its peak.<sup>116</sup>

Several studies have demonstrated the economic and environmental benefits of increasing the fuel economy of cars and light trucks. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), if the Bush administration increased new-passenger-vehicle fuel economy to 40 mpg by 2015, consumers would cut their 2015 gasoline bills by 36 billion gallons per year, saving \$50 billion at the gas pump. By 2015, we also would reduce our oil dependence by 2.3 million barrels per day and cut global warming pollution by 106 million metric tons per year.<sup>117</sup>

## Renewable Energy

Currently, only about 2.3 percent of the country's electricity comes from renewable resources. The technical potential of wind, biomass, and geothermal resources in the United States, however, is four times greater than our current total electricity consumption.<sup>118</sup>

Numerous studies have documented the environmental and economic benefits of renewable energy. UCS looked at the benefits of passing a renewable energy standard requiring that 20 percent of America's electricity come from renewable sources by 2020. UCS found that under a 20 percent by 2020 standard, total consumer savings from lower energy prices would be \$49 billion by 2020. The standard also would reduce power plant carbon dioxide emissions by 434 million metric tons per year by 2020—a reduction of 15 percent below business-as-usual levels.<sup>119</sup> Similarly, a recent analysis by U.S. PIRG Education Fund found that a 20 percent by 2020 renewable energy standard would increase America's gross domestic product by \$11.1 billion and save consumers \$8.9 billion on natural gas costs by 2020.<sup>120</sup>

## Energy Efficiency

Energy efficiency is the quickest, cheapest, cleanest way to reduce energy consumption and save consumers money. Conservative estimates suggest that we still have the potential to reduce our electricity use in the U.S. by 28 percent by 2020.<sup>121</sup>

In 2001, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) looked at nine policies to increase the efficiency of our buildings, homes, appliances, and vehicles and estimated what effect these policies would have

on the economy, energy use, and pollution. ACEEE found that under business as usual, emissions of carbon dioxide, the primary global warming gas, would be 54 percent higher by 2020 than 1990 levels. If the U.S. implemented these nine energy and fuel efficiency measures, carbon dioxide emissions would be only 15 percent above 1990 levels. Similarly, relative to business as usual, annual oil use would fall by about 19 percent and oil imports by about 40 percent by 2020.<sup>122</sup>

## ExxonMobil: An Obstacle to a Cleaner Energy Future

ExxonMobil represents America's failed energy strategy, one that is taking us backward when we desperately need to move forward. By lobbying against global warming solutions and for keeping oil as a central component of America's energy strategy, ExxonMobil is an obstacle on the path toward a new energy future.

---

## Conclusion and Recommendations

ExxonMobil has the power to wreak significant damage on the world's environment, but it also has the power to direct the oil industry and American decision-makers toward a new energy future. As the world's largest and most profitable oil company, ExxonMobil should shed its past as an irresponsible oil company and move forward as a responsible energy company—one committed to more than drilling to the last drop.

ExxonMobil should:

- Commit to not drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and pull out of Arctic Power, the single issue lobbying group dedicated to drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

- Support mandatory caps on global warming pollution and stop funding junk science to obscure the facts about global warming.
- Save consumers money at the pump and ease our oil dependence by investing in renewable energy and energy efficiency and supporting stronger fuel economy standards to make cars go farther on a gallon of gasoline.
- Pay all of the punitive damages awarded in 1994 to fishermen and others injured by the 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.

---

# Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Stacey C. Davis, *Transportation Energy Data Book: Edition 23*, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 2003, citing U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, *Annual Energy Review 2002*, Washington, DC, July 2003, Table 11.9 and updates from the *International Petroleum Monthly*, July 2003.
- <sup>2</sup> The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, “Questions and Answers,” <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/facts/qanda.html>; *A Contingent Valuation Study of Lost Passive Use Values Resulting from the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill*, November 1992, <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/pdf/econ5.pdf>.
- <sup>3</sup> Nelson D. Schwartz, “Poor little rich company,” *Fortune*, April 18, 2005.
- <sup>4</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *IPCC Third Assessment Report – Climate Change 2001: Summary for Policy Makers*, 2001; and World Meteorological Organization, United Nations, *WMO Statement on the Status of the Global Climate in 2004: Global Temperature in 2004 Fourth Warmest* (press release), 15 December 2004, downloaded from [www.wmo.ch/index-en.html](http://www.wmo.ch/index-en.html), January 5, 2005.
- <sup>5</sup> World Meteorological Organization, United Nations, *WMO Statement on the Status of the Global Climate in 2004: Global Temperature in 2004 Fourth Warmest* (press release), December 15, 2004, downloaded from [www.wmo.ch/index-en.html](http://www.wmo.ch/index-en.html), January 5, 2005.
- <sup>6</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *IPCC Third Assessment Report – Climate Change 2001: Summary for Policy Makers*, 2001.
- <sup>7</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *IPCC Third Assessment Report – Climate Change 2001: Summary for Policy Makers*, 2001.
- <sup>8</sup> Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, *Impacts of a Warming Arctic*, 2004, available at <http://www.acia.uaf.edu/pages/overview.html>.
- <sup>9</sup> EPA, *Global Warming – Impacts, Western Mountains* (fact sheet), downloaded from <http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/ImpactsMountainsWesternMountains.html#changingeco>, January 5, 2005.
- <sup>10</sup> Friends of the Earth International, “Exxon’s Climate Footprint: The Contribution of ExxonMobil to Climate Change Since 1882,” January 2004, available at [http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/exxons\\_climate\\_footprint.pdf](http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/exxons_climate_footprint.pdf).
- <sup>11</sup> See NRDC, “Global Warming Science: An Annotated Bibliography,” accessed July 5, 2005 at <http://www.nrdc.org/globalWarming/fgwscience.asp>.
- <sup>12</sup> “Joint science academies’ statement: Global response to climate change,” June 7, 2005, accessed July 5, 2005 at <http://nationalacademies.org/onpi/06072005.pdf>.
- <sup>13</sup> Union of Concerned Scientists, “Scientists’ Statement on Climate Change,” accessed July 5, 2005 at [http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_environment/global\\_warming/page.cfm?pageID=1264#Letter](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_environment/global_warming/page.cfm?pageID=1264#Letter).
- <sup>14</sup> ExxonMobil, “Climate Change: Our View,” accessed July 3, 2005 at [http://www.exxonmobil.com/Europe-English/Citizen/Eu\\_VP\\_climate.asp](http://www.exxonmobil.com/Europe-English/Citizen/Eu_VP_climate.asp).
- <sup>15</sup> ExxonMobil, “Global Climate Change – A Better Path Forward,” April 2000.
- <sup>16</sup> Remarks by Lee R. Raymond, Chairman and CEO, ExxonMobil Corporation, 7th Annual Asia Oil & Gas Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. June 10, 2002, available at [http://www2.exxonmobil.com/corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp\\_NR\\_SpchIntrvw\\_KLSpeech\\_100602.asp](http://www2.exxonmobil.com/corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp_NR_SpchIntrvw_KLSpeech_100602.asp).
- <sup>17</sup> David Buchan and Sheila McNulty, “A Dinosaur Still Hunting for Growth,” *Financial Times*, March 11, 2002.
- <sup>18</sup> ExxonMobil, “Directions for climate research,” February 5, 2004, at <http://www2.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/050204.pdf>; see also ExxonMobil, “Weather and climate,” January 21, 2004, at <http://www.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/220104.pdf>.
- <sup>19</sup> Jeffrey Ball, “Exxon Chief Makes A Cold Calculation On Global Warming,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 2005.
- <sup>20</sup> BP, Climate Change Overview, at <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle.do?categoryId=9002325&contentId=3072033>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>21</sup> ChevronTexaco website, “Global Climate Change,” accessed July 2, 2005 at [http://www.chevron.com/social\\_responsibility/environment/global\\_climate.asp](http://www.chevron.com/social_responsibility/environment/global_climate.asp).
- <sup>22</sup> ConocoPhillips, “Climate Change Position,” accessed July 3, 2005 at <http://www.conocophillips.com/about/Sustainable+Development/Climate+Change+Position+Statement/index.htm>.
- <sup>23</sup> Royal Dutch/Shell website, “Shell’s approach to climate change,” accessed July 3, 2005 at [http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/environment\\_and\\_society/key\\_issues\\_and\\_topics/issues/climate\\_change/zzz\\_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/environment\\_and\\_society/key\\_issues\\_and\\_topics/issues/climate\\_change/shells\\_approach\\_to\\_climate\\_change.html](http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/environment_and_society/key_issues_and_topics/issues/climate_change/zzz_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/environment_and_society/key_issues_and_topics/issues/climate_change/shells_approach_to_climate_change.html).

- 
- <sup>24</sup> Mark Mansley, Claros Consulting, *Sleeping Tiger, Hidden Liabilities*, May 2003. Available at <http://www.campaign ExxonMobil.org/pdf/SleepingTiger.pdf>.
- <sup>25</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005.
- <sup>26</sup> Greenpeace analysis of ExxonMobil's 2003 and 2004 corporate giving reports, [http://ExxonMobil.com/Corporate/files/corporate/giving\\_report.pdf](http://ExxonMobil.com/Corporate/files/corporate/giving_report.pdf) and [www.ExxonMobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/giving04\\_publicpolicy.pdf](http://www.ExxonMobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/giving04_publicpolicy.pdf).
- <sup>27</sup> Greenpeace, "Exxon Money 2004 Key Facts," fact sheet, accessed June 30, 2005 at <http://usaphoto.Greenpeace.org/ExxonMobil-secrets/Exxon%20money%202004%20key%20facts.doc>.
- <sup>28</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>29</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005.
- <sup>30</sup> Jeffrey Ball, "Exxon Chief Makes A Cold Calculation On Global Warming," *Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 2005.
- <sup>31</sup> ExxonMobil, 2003 and 2004 corporate giving reports, [http://ExxonMobil.com/Corporate/files/corporate/giving\\_report.pdf](http://ExxonMobil.com/Corporate/files/corporate/giving_report.pdf) and [www.ExxonMobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/giving04\\_publicpolicy.pdf](http://www.ExxonMobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/giving04_publicpolicy.pdf).
- <sup>32</sup> Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber, Center for Media and Democracy, "How Big Tobacco Helped Create 'the Junkman'," *PR Watch*, Volume 7, No. 3, 2000, available at <http://www.prwatch.org/prwissues/2000Q3/junkman.html>.
- <sup>33</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>34</sup> ALEC website, [www.alec.org](http://www.alec.org).
- <sup>35</sup> See, for example, Patrick J. Michaels, ALEC, *State Factor: Global Warming and the Kyoto Protocol: Paper Tiger, Economic Dragon*, April 2002, at <http://www.alec.org/meSWFiles/pdf/0208.pdf>; Marlo Lewis, Jr., ALEC, *State Factor: Why States Should Reject Multi-"Pollutant" Regulation of Carbon Dioxide*, April 2002, <http://www.alec.org/meSWFiles/pdf/0207.pdf>; ALEC, *Sons of Kyoto: Greenhouse Gas Regulation in the State*, January 2004, at <http://www.alec.org/meSWFiles/pdf/Sons%20of%20Kyoto.pdf>.
- <sup>36</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>37</sup> See, for example, Annapolis Center, *Global Climate Change: Policy Making in the Context of Scientific and Economic Uncertainty*, October 1997, at [www.annapoliscenter.org](http://www.annapoliscenter.org).
- <sup>38</sup> Capital Research Center, Green Watch, <http://www.capitalresearch.org/gw/about/>.
- <sup>39</sup> See, for example, "CEI Notes Some Honesty On Global Warming," GreenWatch Highlight, April 6, 2005, available at <http://www.capitalresearch.org/news/news.asp?ID=298&t=7>.
- <sup>40</sup> Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise website, <http://www.cdfc.org>.
- <sup>41</sup> Marc Morano, "Meteorologist Likens Fear of Global Warming to 'Religious Belief'," *CNSNews.com*, December 2, 2004, available at [http://www.cdfc.org/global\\_warming\\_religion.htm](http://www.cdfc.org/global_warming_religion.htm).
- <sup>42</sup> Paul Driessen, "The new global warming lawsuit industry: Eco-activists add more junk litigation to their anti-civilization arsenal," *This Republic*, December 15, 2004, accessed June 30, 2005 at [http://www.thisrepublic.net/newarticles/The\\_new\\_global\\_warming\\_lawsuit\\_industry.php](http://www.thisrepublic.net/newarticles/The_new_global_warming_lawsuit_industry.php).
- <sup>43</sup> Paul Driessen, CFACT, "Bringing facts, compassion to global warming issue," March 15, 2004, [http://www.cfact.org/site/view\\_article.asp?idCategory=4&idarticle=436](http://www.cfact.org/site/view_article.asp?idCategory=4&idarticle=436).
- <sup>44</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>45</sup> CEI, Global Warming, <http://www.cei.org/sections/subsection.cfm?section=3>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>46</sup> CEI, Myron Ebell biography, at [http://www.cei.org/dyn/view\\_Expert.cfm?Expert=125](http://www.cei.org/dyn/view_Expert.cfm?Expert=125), accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>47</sup> Consumer Alert website, <http://www.consumeralert.org/info/activity.htm>.
- <sup>48</sup> Michael Fumento, "Global Warming Hotheads Use Anything to Justify their Theory," <http://www.consumeralert.org/fumento/blizzard.htm>.
- <sup>49</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>50</sup> The George C. Marshall Institute, "Climate Issues & Questions," December 2004, available at <http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/268.pdf>.
- <sup>51</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>52</sup> IPN, "Time to speak up for climate-change science, March 31, 2005, at [http://www.policynetwork.net/main/article.php?article\\_id=652](http://www.policynetwork.net/main/article.php?article_id=652); .
- <sup>53</sup> *Climate Change and Sustainable Development: A Blueprint from the Sustainable Development Network*, 12 authors, published November 19, 2004, London: International Policy Network. Available at [http://www.policynetwork.net/uploaded/pdf/cc\\_sd\\_final.pdf](http://www.policynetwork.net/uploaded/pdf/cc_sd_final.pdf).
- <sup>54</sup> NCPA, [http://eteam.ncpa.org/policy/Global\\_Warming/](http://eteam.ncpa.org/policy/Global_Warming/).
- <sup>55</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>56</sup> EnviroTruth, "Myths and Envirotruth Regarding Climate Change," <http://www.envirotruth.org/myths.cfm>.
- <sup>57</sup> The Cooler Heads Coalition, <http://www.globalwarming.org/article.php?uid=562>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>58</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).

- 
- <sup>59</sup> Story adapted from Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).
- <sup>60</sup> Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, *Impacts of a Warming Arctic*, 2004, available at <http://www.acia.uaf.edu/pages/overview.html>.
- <sup>61</sup> Steven Milloy, "Polar Bear Scare on Thin Ice," November 12, 2004, available at <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,138346,00.html>.
- <sup>62</sup> George C. Marshall Institute, "Senate Commerce Hearing Promotes Climate Alarmism," press release, November 15, 2004, at <http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/270.pdf>.
- <sup>63</sup> Dr. Kenneth Green, Fraser Institute, "Arctic Warming Scares Continue, Despite Meagre Data," November 16, 2004, at <http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/shared/readmore1.asp?sNav=ed&id=319>.
- <sup>64</sup> See Greenpeace, *Denial and Deception: A Chronicle of ExxonMobil's Corruption of the Debate on Global Warming*, May 2002.
- <sup>65</sup> Greenpeace, *Denial and Deception: A Chronicle of ExxonMobil's Corruption of the Debate on Global Warming*, May 2002: 3.
- <sup>66</sup> John Browne, "Addressing global climate change," May 19, 1997, Stanford University, California, available at <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=98&contentId=2000427>.
- <sup>67</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).
- <sup>68</sup> Global Climate Coalition, front page, <http://www.globalclimate.org/>, accessed June 13, 2005.
- <sup>69</sup> Plan contents provided in memo from Joe Walker to Global Climate Science Team, subject: "Draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan," that was leaked to *The New York Times*, April 1998; reprinted in *The Oil Industry and Climate Change*, Greenpeace International, August 1998. Full API memo available in the appendix of Greenpeace, *Denial and Deception: A Chronicle of ExxonMobil's Corruption of the Debate on Global Warming*, May 2002.
- <sup>70</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).
- <sup>71</sup> Jeremy Leggett, *The Carbon War: Global Warming and the End of the Oil Era* (Routledge, 2000), 2-3.
- <sup>72</sup> Greenpeace, *Denial and Deception: A Chronicle of ExxonMobil's Corruption of the Debate on Global Warming*, May 2002: 6.
- <sup>73</sup> Memo from Randy Randol, ExxonMobil to John Howard, White House CEQ, dated February 6, 2001, obtained by the Natural Resources Defense Council. Available at <http://www.nrdc.org/media/docs/020403.pdf>.
- <sup>74</sup> NRDC, "ExxonMobil, Bush Administration Succeed in Ousting Top Global Warming Scientist During Heated Geneva Meeting," April 19, 2002, at <http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/020419a.asp>; Memo from Randy Randol, ExxonMobil to John Howard, White House CEQ, dated February 6, 2001, obtained by the Natural Resources Defense Council, available at <http://www.nrdc.org/media/docs/020403.pdf>; Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005.
- <sup>75</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).
- <sup>76</sup> Greenpeace, Documents received from State Department pursuant to FOIA request, accessed June 30, 2005 at <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/news/kyoto-now/read-our-foia-documents>.
- <sup>77</sup> John Vidal, "Revealed: How Oil Giant Influenced Bush," *The Guardian (UK)*, June 8, 2005.
- <sup>78</sup> Chris Mooney, "Some Like It Hot," *Mother Jones*, May/June 2005. Also see Greenpeace's Exxon Secrets website at [www.exxonsecrets.org](http://www.exxonsecrets.org).
- <sup>79</sup> Andrew Revkin, "Bush Aide Edited Climate Reports," *New York Times*, June 8, 2005; Andrew Revkin, "Former Bush Aide Who Edited Reports Is Hired by Exxon," *New York Times*, June 15, 2005.
- <sup>80</sup> John Vidal, "Revealed: How Oil Giant Influenced Bush," *The Guardian (UK)*, June 8, 2005.
- <sup>81</sup> Arctic Power, <http://www.anwr.org/>.
- <sup>82</sup> ExxonMobil, "From darkness to light," opinion-editorial, August 2, 2001, at <http://www.exxonmobil.com/Files/Corporate/080201.pdf>.
- <sup>83</sup> "The Role of Energy in the 21st Century," Remarks by Rex W. Tillerson, President, ExxonMobil Corporation, Dallas, Texas, March 4, 2005, available at [http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp\\_NR\\_SpchIntrvw\\_RWT\\_040305.asp](http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp_NR_SpchIntrvw_RWT_040305.asp).
- <sup>84</sup> Energy Information Administration, "Retail Gasoline Historical Prices," available at <http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/oog/ftparea/wogirs/xls/pswrgvwvnu.xls>. Average is for all grades and all formulations for January 3, 2005 through June 27, 2005.
- <sup>85</sup> Jeannine Aversa, "Experts keep close eye on energy prices," *Associated Press*, May 2, 2005; Michael J. Martinez, "Wall St. uncertainty outweighs good news," *Associated Press*, May 9, 2005; "Crude Oil Prices Rise Above \$51 Mark," *Associated Press*, May 9, 2005; Alexandra Marks and Robert Tuttle, "Oil prices spread to grapes, TVs, pizza," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 29, 2005; "High gas prices make consumers gloomy," *Reuters*, April 26, 2005, available at [http://money.cnn.com/2005/04/26/news/economy/consumer\\_confidence.reut/](http://money.cnn.com/2005/04/26/news/economy/consumer_confidence.reut/).

- 
- <sup>86</sup> ExxonMobil, 2004 Annual Report, available at [http://www.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/AR\\_2004.pdf](http://www.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/AR_2004.pdf).
- <sup>87</sup> ExxonMobil, "Exxon Mobil Corporation Announces Estimated First Quarter 2005 Results," press release, April 28, 2005.
- <sup>88</sup> "Exxon CEO's 2004 paycheck: \$38 million," *Associated Press*, April 14, 2005.
- <sup>89</sup> Nelson D. Schwartz, "Poor little rich company," *Fortune*, April 18, 2005.
- <sup>90</sup> Nelson D. Schwartz, "Poor little rich company," *Fortune*, April 18, 2005.
- <sup>91</sup> See "Stepping Up to the Plate," Remarks by Lee R. Raymond, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, ExxonMobil Corporation, Before the Energy Policy Foundation of Norway - Sanderstolen Conference -Sanderstolen, Norway, February 2, 2005, available at [http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp\\_NR\\_SpchIntrvw\\_LRR\\_020205.asp](http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp_NR_SpchIntrvw_LRR_020205.asp); "The Role of Energy in the 21st Century," Remarks by Rex W. Tillerson, President, ExxonMobil Corporation, Dallas, Texas, March 4, 2005, available at [http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp\\_NR\\_SpchIntrvw\\_RWT\\_040305.asp](http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp_NR_SpchIntrvw_RWT_040305.asp).
- <sup>92</sup> Deepa Babington, "Solar, wind energy fail Exxon profit test," *Reuters*, May 30, 2005.
- <sup>93</sup> Management Information Services (MIS), *Federal Incentives for the Energy Industries*, 1998.
- <sup>94</sup> "The Role of Energy in the 21st Century," Remarks by Rex W. Tillerson, President, ExxonMobil Corporation, Dallas, Texas, March 4, 2005, available at [http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp\\_NR\\_SpchIntrvw\\_RWT\\_040305.asp](http://exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/SpchsIntvws/Corp_NR_SpchIntrvw_RWT_040305.asp).
- <sup>95</sup> ExxonMobil, 2004 Summary Statement of Income, accessed July 4, 2005 at [http://www.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/AR\\_2004\\_statementincome.pdf](http://www.exxonmobil.com/corporate/files/corporate/AR_2004_statementincome.pdf).
- <sup>96</sup> Goldie Blumenstyk, "Greening the World or 'Greenwashing' a Reputation?," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 10, 2003.
- <sup>97</sup> Jeffrey Ball, "Exxon Chief Makes A Cold Calculation On Global Warming," *Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 2005.
- <sup>98</sup> Royal Dutch/Shell, "Renewables," accessed July 4, 2005 at [http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what\\_we\\_do/renewables/zzz\\_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what\\_we\\_do/renewables/renewables.html](http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what_we_do/renewables/zzz_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what_we_do/renewables/renewables.html).
- <sup>99</sup> Shell Solar, "World's biggest solar PV plant to be built in Bavaria, Germany," press release, June 23, 2005.
- <sup>100</sup> Royal Dutch/Shell, "Renewables," accessed July 4, 2005 at [http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what\\_we\\_do/renewables/zzz\\_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what\\_we\\_do/renewables/renewables.html](http://www.shell.com/home/Framework?siteId=royal-en&FC2=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what_we_do/renewables/zzz_lhn.html&FC3=/royal-en/html/iwgen/what_we_do/renewables/renewables.html).
- <sup>101</sup> Jeffrey Ball, "Exxon Chief Makes A Cold Calculation On Global Warming," *Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 2005.
- <sup>102</sup> BP, "Renewable and alternative energy," accessed July 4, 2005 at <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle.do?categoryId=22&contentId=2006538>.
- <sup>103</sup> The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, "Questions and Answers," <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/facts/qanda.html>; *A Contingent Valuation Study of Lost Passive Use Values Resulting from the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill*, November 1992, <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/pdf/econ5.pdf>.
- <sup>104</sup> ExxonMobil, "ExxonMobil Sets Valdez Record Straight," October 6, 2004.
- <sup>105</sup> ExxonMobil, "ExxonMobil Statement - The Condition of Prince William Sound," accessed June 30, 2005 at [http://exxonmobil.com/corporate/Newsroom/NewsReleases/Corp\\_NR\\_Condition.asp](http://exxonmobil.com/corporate/Newsroom/NewsReleases/Corp_NR_Condition.asp).
- <sup>106</sup> Charles H. Peterson, Stanley D. Rice, Jeffrey W. Short, Daniel Esler, James L. Bodkin, Brenda E. Ballachey, David B. Irons, "Long-Term Ecosystem Response to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill," *Science*, December 19, 2003.
- <sup>107</sup> Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Plan, Update on Injured Resources and Services*, August 2002, accessed July 5, 2005 at <http://www.evostc.state.ak.us/pdf/restoration/injupdate02.pdf>.
- <sup>108</sup> Center for Responsive Politics, [www.opensecrets.org](http://www.opensecrets.org), July 3, 2005. Number based on contributions of \$200 or more from PACs and individuals to federal candidates and from PAC, individual and soft money donors to political parties, as reported to the Federal Election Commission.
- <sup>109</sup> Public Citizen, *Bush's 2005 Inauguration Celebration: Brought to You by Corporate America*, January 2005. Available at <http://www.whitehouseforsale.org/documents/Inaug-II.pdf>.
- <sup>110</sup> Center for Responsive Politics, ExxonMobil Top Recipients Among Federal Candidates, 1990-2004, accessed July 3, 2005 at <http://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/toprecips.asp?ID=D000000129&Type=P&Sort=A&Cycle=A>.
- <sup>111</sup> Senate Office of Public Records, <http://sopr.senate.gov/>, accessed June 12, 2005.
- <sup>112</sup> Center for Public Integrity, Lobby Watch, ExxonMobil Corp., at <http://www.publicintegrity.org/lobby/profile.aspx?act=clients&year=2003&cl=L001656&sub=1>. Accessed April 18, 2005.
- <sup>113</sup> Senate Office of Public Records, <http://sopr.senate.gov/>, accessed April 14, 2005.
- <sup>114</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, 1002 Area, Petroleum Assessment, 1998, Fact Sheet 0028-01, available at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs-0028-01/>.
- <sup>115</sup> National Research Council, *Effectiveness and Impact of Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards*, 2002.

---

<sup>116</sup> Estimates of the peak yield of the Arctic Refuge (between 639,000 to 1,595,000 barrels per day, with a mean estimate of 876,000 barrels per day) found in Energy Information Administration, *Analysis of Oil and Gas Production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge*, March 2004. Available at <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/servicerpt/ogp/index.html>. Estimates of savings from a phased-in 40 mpg standard over ten years (5.4 million barrels per day by 2020) found in Union of Concerned Scientists, *Drilling in Detroit*, June 2001. Available at <http://www.ucsusa.org/publication.cfm?publicationID=99>.

<sup>117</sup> Union of Concerned Scientists, *Creating Jobs, Saving Energy and Protecting the Environment*, July 2004. Available at <http://www.ucsusa.org/documents/FuelEconomyJobs.pdf>.

<sup>118</sup> U.S. PIRG Education Fund, *Generating Solutions: How Clean, Renewable Energy is Boosting Local Economies and Saving Consumers Money*, April 2003.

<sup>119</sup> Union of Concerned Scientists, *Renewing America's Economy: A 20% National Renewable Electricity Standard Will Create Jobs and Save Consumers Money*, September 2004. Available at [www.ucsusa.org/clean\\_energy/renewable\\_energy/page.cfm?pageID=1505](http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/renewable_energy/page.cfm?pageID=1505).

<sup>120</sup> U.S. PIRG Education Fund, *Redirecting America's Energy: The Economic and Consumer Benefits of Clean Energy Policies*, February 2005.

<sup>121</sup> S. Nadel, A. Monis Shipley, R.N. Elliott, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, *The Technical, Economic, and Achievable Potential for Energy Efficiency in the United States: A Meta-Analysis of Recent Studies*, 2004.

<sup>122</sup> Steven Nadel, ACEEE, *Smart Energy Policies: Saving Money and Reducing Pollutant Emissions through Greater Energy Efficiency*, 2001. Accessed on July 1, 2005 at <http://aceee.org/pubs/e012full.pdf>.