
United States Court Of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *Plaintiff-Appellee*

v.

EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION, et al., *Defendants-Appellants*

On Appeal From The United States District Court,
District of Columbia
Case No. 20-cv-1932
(Hon. Timothy J. Kelly)

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE ROBERT BRULLE, CENTER FOR
CLIMATE INTEGRITY, CHESAPEAKE CLIMATE ACTION
NETWORK, JUSTIN FARRELL, BENJAMIN FRANTA,
STEPHAN LEWANDOWSKY, NAOMI ORESKES, GEOFFREY
SUPRAN, and the UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE AND AFFIRMANCE**

ALISON S. GAFFNEY
DANIEL P. MENSHER
KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
1201 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 3200
SEATTLE, WA 98101-3052
Tel: (206) 623-1900

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	1
IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	2
I. DEFENDANTS HAD ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR FOSSIL FUEL PRODUCTS.....	2
A. Defendants had early knowledge that fossil fuel products were causing an increase in atmospheric CO ₂ concentrations, and that this increase could result in “catastrophic” consequences.	2
B. Defendants conducted their own climate science research that confirmed fossil fuel combustion was increasing atmospheric CO ₂ concentrations and that this would affect the climate.....	8
II. DEFENDANTS TOOK PROACTIVE STEPS TO CONCEAL THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND DISCREDIT CLIMATE SCIENCE.....	16
A. Defendants developed sophisticated public relations strategies to hide the risks of climate change and create doubt about the scientific consensus of global warming.	17
B. Defendants engaged in public communications campaigns designed to manufacture doubt and downplay the threats of climate change.	20
C. Defendants funded individuals, organizations, and research to discredit the growing body of publicly available climate science.....	25

III. DEFENDANTS MOVED TO PROTECT THEIR OWN ASSETS FROM CLIMATE RISKS BASED ON THE SCIENCE THEY PUBLICLY DISCREDITED 28

IV. DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO MISLEAD AND DECEIVE THE PUBLIC THROUGH GREENWASHING AND OTHER MISREPRESENTATIONS 31

V. CONCLUSION 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Other Authorities	Page(s)
<i>2007 Corporate Citizenship Report</i> , ExxonMobil (2007)	27
American Petroleum Institute, <i>Natural Gas Solutions: We're On It!</i>	32
Amy Lieberman and Susanne Rust, <i>Big Oil braced for global warming while it fought regulations</i> , Los Angeles Times (Dec. 31, 2015)	29, 30
Amy Westervelt, <i>Drilled: A True Crime Podcast about Climate Change</i> , Episode 2, The Turn (Nov. 15, 2018)	25
Amy Westervelt, <i>Drilled: A True Crime Podcast about Climate Change</i> , Episode, The Bell Labs of Energy (Nov. 14, 2018).....	8
<i>AQ-9 Task Force Meeting Minutes</i> , American Petroleum Institute (Mar. 18, 1980).....	10
<i>Atmospheric Greenhouse Effect: Is Burning of Fossil Fuels Affecting World Climate?</i> , Mobil Oil Corp., Status Report Environmental & Toxicology Issue No. 83-2 (June 1, 1983).....	8
Benjamin Franta, <i>Early oil industry knowledge of CO₂ and global warming</i> , 8 Nature Climate Change 1024 (Nov. 19, 2018).....	3
Benjamin Franta, <i>Shell and Exxon's secret 1980s climate change warnings</i> , The Guardian (Sept. 19, 2018).....	14
Chevron, <i>The Power of Human Energy</i>	32
Edward Teller, <i>Energy patterns of the future</i> , 38 Energy and Man: A Symposium (1960)	4
Elmer Robinson and R.C. Robbins, <i>Sources, Abundance, and Fate of Gaseous Atmospheric Pollutants</i> , Stanford Research Institute (1968)	6

<i>Environmental Research, A Status Report</i> , American Petroleum Institute (Jan. 1972)	6
<i>Evolution of Mobil’s Public Affairs Programs 1970-81</i> , Mobil.....	22
<i>Exxon and Mobil Ads</i> , Polluter Watch	22
<i>ExxonMobil Foundation & Corporate Giving to Climate Change Denier & Obstructionist Organizations</i> , Union of Concerned Scientists (2019)	27, 28
Frank Ikard, <i>Meeting the challenges of 1966</i> , Proceedings of the American Petroleum Institute (1965)	5
Geoffrey Supran and Naomi Oreskes, <i>Assessing ExxonMobil’s climate change communications (1977–2014)</i> , 12(8) Environmental Research Letters (Aug. 23, 2017).....	9
<i>Global Climate Coalition: An Overview</i> , Global Climate Coalition (Nov. 1996)	19
<i>Global Climate Science Communications Team Action Plan</i> , American Petroleum Institute (Apr. 3, 1998)	24, 25
<i>Global Mean CO₂ Mixing Ratios (ppm): Observations</i> , NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies	6
<i>Global warming: who’s right? Facts about a debate that’s turned up more questions than answers</i> , Exxon Corporation (1996)	21
<i>Greenhouse Effect: Shell Anticipates A Sea Change</i> , New York Times (Dec. 20, 1989).....	29
H.R. Brannon, A.C. Daughtry, D. Perry, W.W. Whitaker, and M. Williams, <i>Radiocarbon evidence on the dilution of atmospheric and oceanic carbon by carbon from fossil fuels</i> , 38 Trans. Am. Geophys. Union 643 (Oct. 1957).....	4

InfluenceMap, <i>Big Oil's Real Agenda on Climate Change</i> 10 (Mar. 2019)	32
James Osborne, <i>INTERVIEW: Former Exxon scientist on oil giant's 1970s climate change research</i> , Dallas News (Oct. 2015).....	7
Kathy Mulvey and Seth Shulman, <i>The Climate Deception Dossiers: Internal Fossil Fuel Industry Memos Reveal Decades of Corporate Disinformation</i> , Union of Concerned Scientists 22 (July 2015).....	23
Lawrence Carter, <i>Inside Exxon's Playbook: How America's biggest oil company continues to oppose action on climate change</i> (June 30, 2021)	27
Letter from Dr. Patrick Michaels, Information Council on the Environment (May 15, 1991)	23
Memo from A.M. Natkin to H.N. Weinberg re CRL/CO ₂ Greenhouse Program, Exxon Corporation (June 18, 1982)	16
Memo from Gregory J. Dana to AIAM Technical Committee re Global Climate Coalition (GCC) – Primer on Climate Change Science – Final Draft, Association of International Automobile Manufacturers (Jan. 18, 1996)	20
Memo from Henry Shaw to Dr. E.E. David, Jr. re “CO ₂ Position Statement”, Exxon Inter-Office Correspondence (May 15, 1981)	11
Memo from J.F. Black to F.G. Turpin re The Greenhouse Effect, Exxon Research and Engineering Company (June 6, 1978).....	7
Memo from Joseph Carlson to DGL re The Greenhouse Effect (Aug. 3, 1988).....	17
Memo from M.B. Glaser to Exxon Management re CO ₂ “Greenhouse” Effect, Exxon Research and Engineering Company (Nov. 12, 1982).....	9

Memo from R. W. Cohen to A.M. Natkin, Exxon Research and Engineering Company (Sept. 2, 1982).....	12
Memo from R.W. Cohen to W. Glass re possible “catastrophic” effect of CO ₂ , Exxon Corporation (Aug. 18, 1981).....	11, 12, 13
Memo from W.L. Ferrall to R.L. Hirsch re “Controlling Atmospheric CO ₂ ”, The Exxon Research and Engineering Company (Oct. 16, 1979).....	10
Mobil, <i>CNN and the value of instant replay</i> , New York Times (Oct. 16, 1997).....	22
P. Langcake, <i>The Enhanced Greenhouse Effect: A Review of the Scientific Aspects</i> , Shell Internationale Petroleum Maatschappij B.V. (Dec. 1994).....	18
Pattanun Achakulwisut et al., <i>Ending ExxonMobil Sponsorship of the American Geophysical Union</i> (Mar. 2016).....	28
R.P.W.M Jacobs et al., <i>The Greenhouse Effect</i> , Shell Internationale Petroleum Maatschappij B.V., The Hague (May 1988)	14
Riley Dunlap and Aaron McCright, <i>Organized Climate Change Denial</i> , The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society (2011)	27
Roger Revelle and Hans Suess, <i>Carbon Dioxide Exchange Between Atmosphere and Ocean and the Question of an Increase of Atmospheric CO₂ during the Past Decades</i> , 9 Tellus 18 (1957)	3
Sally Brain Gentile et al., <i>Reinventing Energy: Making the Right Choices</i> , American Petroleum Institute (1996).....	22

Smoke and Fumes: The Legal and Evidentiary Basis for Holding Big Oil Accountable for the Climate Crisis, Center for International Environmental Law 12 (Nov. 2017)..... 5, 6

Suzanne McCarron, *A Better Approach on Climate Change*, ExxonMobil (Jan. 10, 2018) 27

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1, Amicus Center for Climate Integrity certifies that it is a non-profit organization. The Center for Climate Integrity does not have a parent corporation, and no publicly held company has any ownership of the organization. Amicus Chesapeake Climate Action Network also certifies that it is a non-profit organization. The Chesapeake Climate Action Network does not have a parent corporation, and no publicly held company has any ownership of the organization. Amicus Union of Concerned Scientists also certifies that it is a non-profit organization. The Union of Concerned Scientists does not have a parent corporation, and no publicly held company has any ownership of the organization. All other amici are private individuals and not corporations.

IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

Individual Amici are scholars and scientists with strong interests, education, and experience in the environment and the science of climate change, with particular interest in public information and communication about climate change and how the public and public officials learn about and understand climate change.

Dr. Naomi Oreskes is Professor of the History of Science and Affiliated Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard University. Dr. Oreskes' research focuses on the earth and environmental sciences, with a particular interest in understanding scientific consensus and dissent. **Dr. Geoffrey Supran** is an Associate Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Policy at the University of Miami's Rosenstiel School of Marine, Atmospheric, and Earth Science. Dr. Supran's applied social science research investigates the history of climate change disinformation and propaganda by fossil fuel interests. **Dr. Robert Brulle** is a Visiting Professor of Environment and Society at Brown University, and an Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Environmental Science at Drexel University. His research focuses on U.S. environmental politics, critical theory, and

the political and cultural dynamics of climate change. **Dr. Justin Farrell** is a Professor in the School of Forestry and Environmental Science, the School of Management, and the Department of Sociology at Yale University. He studies environment, misinformation, rural inequality, and social movements using a range of methods from large-scale computational text analysis, network science, machine learning, and qualitative and ethnographic fieldwork. **Dr. Benjamin Franta** is a Senior Research Fellow in Climate Litigation at the University of Oxford Sustainable Law Programme. Dr. Franta holds a Ph.D. in History from Stanford University, where he studied the history of climate science and fossil fuel producers. He holds a separate Ph.D. in Applied Physics from Harvard University and a J.D. from Stanford Law School. **Stephan Lewandowsky** is a Professor and Chair in Cognitive Science at the University of Bristol. His research examines the potential conflict between human cognition and the physics of the global climate.

The Center for Climate Integrity is a non-profit organization that works to empower communities and elected officials with the knowledge and tools they need to hold polluters accountable for their

contributions to the climate crisis. Through campaigns, communications, and strategic legal support, the organization works to ensure that the fossil fuel industry pays its fair share of the costs of climate change.

The Chesapeake Climate Action Network is a non-profit organization dedicated to fighting climate change and addressing the harms caused by fossil fuel infrastructure in Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., and to securing policies that will put the world on a path to climate stability.

The Union of Concerned Scientists is a national non-profit organization that puts rigorous, independent science to work to solve our planet's most pressing problems. The organization combines technical analysis and effective advocacy to create innovative, practical solutions for a healthy, safe, and sustainable future.

Amici submit this brief because they understand that the conduct at the core of the Plaintiff-Appellee's Complaint is that the Defendants affirmatively and knowingly concealed and denied the hazards that they knew would result from the normal use of their fossil fuel products by misrepresenting those products and deliberately discrediting

scientific information related to climate change. As such, it is critical to the ultimate outcome of this appeal that full documentation of these misrepresentations is available to the Court as it considers the arguments and claims made by Defendants-Appellants.

All parties have consented to the filing of this brief. No party's counsel authored the brief in whole or in part, no party or party's counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing of submitting the brief, and no person other than amici or their counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief.

INTRODUCTION

At least 50 years ago, Defendants-Appellants (hereinafter “Defendants”) had information from their own internal research, as well as from the international scientific community, that the unabated extraction, production, promotion, and sale of their fossil fuel products would result in material dangers to the public. Defendants failed to disclose this information or take steps to protect the public. Instead, they acted to conceal their knowledge and discredit climate science, running misleading nationwide marketing campaigns and funding scientists and third-party organizations to exaggerate scientific uncertainty and promote contrarian theories that directly contradicted Defendants’ own research and actions Defendants took to protect their assets from climate change impacts.

Defendants’ coordinated, multi-front effort, demonstrated by their own documents and actions, justifies the claims that Plaintiff-Appellee (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) has made. As early as the late 1950s and no later than 1968, Defendants had actual knowledge of the risks associated with their fossil fuel products. In the decades that followed, Defendants took affirmative steps to sow doubt and uncertainty about

climate change. While they told the world there was no reason for concern, Defendants took climate risks into account in managing their infrastructure—for example, by raising the height of their oil rigs to account for rising sea levels.

While their tactics have changed, Defendants' overall strategy of deception continues to this day. Defendants now acknowledge that the climate is changing and claim to be leaders in efforts to combat climate change. However, they continue to run marketing and lobbying campaigns intended to mislead policymakers and the public about climate change and Defendants' role in causing it.

In taking these actions, Defendants deceived—and continue to deceive—consumers in Washington, D.C., and therefore should be held liable in D.C. court.

I. DEFENDANTS HAD ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR FOSSIL FUEL PRODUCTS

A. Defendants had early knowledge that fossil fuel products were causing an increase in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, and that this increase could result in “catastrophic” consequences.

Defendants knew about the potential risks associated with their products decades ago, independently and through their membership

and involvement in trade associations such as the American Petroleum Institute (API).

API and its members were aware of research on carbon dioxide as early as 1954, when Harrison Brown and other scientists at the California Institute of Technology measured and assessed increased CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere.¹ Although the results were not published, API and other researchers within the petroleum industry were aware of this research.² In 1957, Roger Revelle and Hans Suess at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography published a paper that predicted large increases in atmospheric CO₂ if fossil fuel production continued unabated.³ Shortly after, H.R. Brannon of Humble Oil (now Exxon) published research on the same question. His conclusions were in

¹ Benjamin Franta, *Early oil industry knowledge of CO₂ and global warming*, 8 *Nature Climate Change* 1024 (Nov. 19, 2018), <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-018-0349-9>.

² *Id.*

³ Roger Revelle and Hans Suess, *Carbon Dioxide Exchange Between Atmosphere and Ocean and the Question of an Increase of Atmospheric CO₂ during the Past Decades*, 9 *Tellus* 18 (1957), <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3402/tellusa.v9i1.9075?needAccess=true>.

“excellent agreement” with Brown’s findings: increased fossil fuel combustion caused an increase in atmospheric CO₂.⁴

In 1959, physicist Edward Teller delivered the earliest known warning of the dangers of global warming to the petroleum industry. Teller described the need to find energy sources other than fossil fuels to mitigate these dangers, stating:

[A] temperature rise corresponding to a 10 per cent increase in carbon dioxide will be sufficient to melt the icecap and submerge New York. All the coastal cities would be covered, and since a considerable percentage of the human race lives in coastal regions, I think that this chemical contamination is more serious than most people tend to believe.⁵

In 1965, API President Frank Ikard informed API’s membership that President Lyndon Johnson’s Science Advisory Committee had predicted that fossil fuels could cause significant climatic changes by

⁴ H.R. Brannon, A.C. Daughtry, D. Perry, W.W. Whitaker, and M. Williams, *Radiocarbon evidence on the dilution of atmospheric and oceanic carbon by carbon from fossil fuels*, 38 *Trans. Am. Geophys. Union* 643, 646 (Oct. 1957), <https://ar.booksc.org/book/52489873/5edd87>.

⁵ Edward Teller, *Energy patterns of the future*, 38 *Energy and Man: A Symposium* 53, 58 (1960).

the end of the century.⁶ He issued the following warning about the consequences of CO₂ pollution to industry leaders:

This report unquestionably will fan emotions, raise fears, and bring demands for action. The substance of the report is that there is still time to save the world's peoples from the catastrophic consequence of pollution, but time is running out.⁷

Over the next few years, scientific research continued to bolster the conclusion that the combustion of fossil fuels would be the primary driver of climate change. A 1968 Stanford Research Institute (SRI) report—commissioned by API and made available to its members—warned that “rising levels of CO₂ would likely result in rising global temperatures and that, if temperatures increased significantly, the result could be melting ice caps, rising sea levels, warming oceans, and serious environmental damage on a global scale.”⁸ The scientists

⁶ Frank Ikard, *Meeting the challenges of 1966*, Proceedings of the American Petroleum Institute 12-15 (1965), <http://www.climatefiles.com/trade-group/american-petroleum-institute/1965-api-president-meeting-the-challenges-of-1966/>.

⁷ *Id.* at 13.

⁸ *Smoke and Fumes: The Legal and Evidentiary Basis for Holding Big Oil Accountable for the Climate Crisis*, Center for International Environmental Law 12 (Nov. 2017), <https://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Smoke-Fumes-FINAL.pdf>.

acknowledged that the burning of fossil fuels provided the best explanation for an increase in atmospheric CO₂ levels.⁹

In 1969, API commissioned a supplemental report by SRI that provided a more detailed assessment on CO₂. The report stated that: atmospheric concentrations of CO₂ were steadily increasing; 90% of this increase could be attributed to fossil fuel combustion; and continued use of fossil fuels would result in further increases of CO₂ levels.¹⁰ The report projected that, based on current fuel usage, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations would reach 370 ppm by 2000—exactly what they turned out to be.¹¹ This research was summarized and shared with API members, including Defendants.¹²

A 1977 presentation and 1978 briefing by senior Exxon scientist James F. Black warned the Exxon Corporation Management Committee that CO₂ concentrations were building in the Earth's atmosphere at an

⁹ Elmer Robinson and R.C. Robbins, *Sources, Abundance, and Fate of Gaseous Atmospheric Pollutants*, Stanford Research Institute 3 (1968), <https://www.smokeandfumes.org/documents/document16>.

¹⁰ *Smoke and Fumes*, *supra* note 8, at 12.

¹¹ *Global Mean CO₂ Mixing Ratios (ppm): Observations*, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, <https://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelforce/ghgases/Fig1A.ext.txt>.

¹² *Environmental Research, A Status Report*, American Petroleum Institute (Jan. 1972), <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED066339.pdf>.

increasing rate, that CO₂ emissions were attributable to fossil fuels, and that CO₂ would contribute to global warming.¹³ Speaking to the emerging scientific consensus on climate change at the time, Black acknowledged that there was general scientific agreement that CO₂ released from the burning of fossil fuels was likely influencing global climate. He stated:

Present thinking holds that man has a time window of five to ten years before the need for hard decisions regarding changes in energy strategies might become critical.¹⁴

Black expressed no uncertainty as to whether the burning of fossil fuels would cause climate change. Former Exxon scientist Ed Garvey described the situation as follows: “By the late 1970s, global warming was no longer speculative.”¹⁵ In another interview, Garvey stated: “The

¹³ Memo from J.F. Black to F.G. Turpin re The Greenhouse Effect, Exxon Research and Engineering Company 2 (June 6, 1978), <http://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/1978-exxon-memo-on-greenhouse-effect-for-exxon-corporation-management-committee/>.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ James Osborne, *INTERVIEW: Former Exxon scientist on oil giant's 1970s climate change research*, Dallas News (Oct. 2015), <https://www.dallasnews.com/business/business/2015/10/02/interview-former-exxon-scientist-on-oil-giants-1970s-climate-change-research>.

issue was not were we going to have a problem, the issue was simply how soon and how fast and how bad was it going to be. Not if.”¹⁶

Through the 1950s and 1960s, there was agreement among industry, government, and academic scientists that the observed increase in CO₂ concentrations, caused by fossil fuel combustion, would likely cause an increase in average global temperatures, and therefore a range of climate-related impacts. By the late 1970s, there was a general scientific consensus that this would occur.

B. Defendants conducted their own climate science research that confirmed fossil fuel combustion was increasing atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and that this would affect the climate.

From the late 1970s through early 1980s, Defendants repeatedly confirmed the findings of leading scientists and institutions studying climate change with their own research.¹⁷

¹⁶ Amy Westervelt, *Drilled: A True Crime Podcast about Climate Change*, Episode 1, The Bell Labs of Energy (interview with Ed Garvey at 14:03) (Nov. 14, 2018), <https://open.spotify.com/show/6zrL0QQWBhIVFsCveE2mtE>.

¹⁷ Between 1983-84, Exxon’s researchers published their results in at least three peer-reviewed papers in the *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* and *American Geophysical Union*. See e.g. *Atmospheric Greenhouse Effect: Is Burning of Fossil Fuels Affecting World Climate?*, Mobil Oil Corp., Status Report Environmental & Toxicology Issue No. 83-2 (June 1, 1983), <https://perma.cc/6A6Y-GQSF>.

Exxon was particularly active in the growing field of climate science. Following warnings by Black and others, Exxon launched an ambitious research program to study the environmental effects of greenhouse gases. The company assembled a team of scientists, modelers, and mathematicians to deepen the company's understanding of an environmental problem that posed an existential threat to its business interests.¹⁸ By 1982, Exxon's scientists had created climate models that confirmed the scientific consensus that the continued increase of CO₂ from fossil fuels would cause significant global warming by the middle of the 21st century with "potentially catastrophic" effects.¹⁹

In 1979, W.L. Ferrall described the findings of an internal Exxon study, concluding that the "present trend of fossil fuel consumption will

¹⁸ Geoffrey Supran and Naomi Oreskes, *Assessing ExxonMobil's climate change communications (1977–2014)*, 12(8) Environmental Research Letters 084019 (Aug. 23, 2017),

<http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aa815f>.

¹⁹ See e.g. Memo from M.B. Glaser to Exxon Management re CO₂ "Greenhouse" Effect, Exxon Research and Engineering Company 11 (Nov. 12, 1982), <https://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/1982-memo-to-exxon-management-about-co2-greenhouse-effect/>.

cause dramatic environmental effects before the year 2050.”²⁰ With a doubling of CO₂ concentration (using 1860 as a baseline), Ferrall predicted that “ocean levels would rise four feet” and the “Arctic Ocean would be ice free for at least six months each year, causing major shifts in weather patterns in the northern hemisphere.”²¹

In 1980, Dr. John Laurman presented to the API Task Force, referencing “strong empirical evidence” that climate change is caused by fossil fuel combustion and identifying the “scientific consensus on the potential for large future climatic response to increased CO₂ levels” as a reason for concern.²² Laurman also warned that foreseeable temperature increases could have “major economic consequences” and “globally catastrophic effects.”²³

²⁰ Memo from W.L. Ferrall to R.L. Hirsch re “Controlling Atmospheric CO₂”, Exxon Research and Engineering Company 1 (Oct. 16, 1979), <http://insideclimatenews.org/sites/default/files/documents/CO2%20and%20Fuel%20Use%20Projections.pdf>.

²¹ *Id.*, Appendix A at 1.

²² *AQ-9 Task Force Meeting Minutes*, American Petroleum Institute, Attachment B at 1-2 (Mar. 18, 1980), <https://insideclimatenews.org/documents/aq-9-task-force-meeting-1980/>.

²³ *Id.*, Attachment B at 5.

By 1981, Exxon had internally acknowledged the risks of climate change and the role that fossil fuel combustion played in increasing CO₂ concentrations. In an internal memorandum, Exxon scientist Henry Shaw wrote that a doubling of CO₂ would result in a 3°C increase in average global temperature and a 10°C increase at the poles, causing major shifts in rainfall/agriculture and melting of polar ice.²⁴

Also in 1981, Roger Cohen, director of Exxon's Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences Laboratory, warned about the magnitude of climate change: "we will unambiguously recognize the threat by the year 2000 because of advances in climate modeling and the beginning of real experimental confirmation of the CO₂ effect."²⁵ He added that "it is distinctly possible that [Exxon Planning Division's] scenario will later produce effects which will indeed be catastrophic (at least for a substantial fraction of the earth's population)."²⁶

²⁴ Memo from Henry Shaw to Dr. E.E. David, Jr. re "CO₂ Position Statement", Exxon Inter-Office Correspondence 2 (May 15, 1981), <https://insideclimatenews.org/documents/aq-9-task-force-meeting-1980/>.

²⁵ Memo from R.W. Cohen to W. Glass re possible "catastrophic" effect of CO₂, Exxon Corporation 1 (Aug. 18, 1981), <http://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/1981-exxon-memo-on-possible-emission-consequences-of-fossil-fuel-consumption>.

²⁶ *Id.*

In 1982, Cohen summarized the findings of Exxon’s research in climate modeling, stating that “over the past several years *a clear scientific consensus has emerged* regarding the expected climatic effects of increased atmospheric CO₂.” (Emphasis added).²⁷ Cohen acknowledged that Exxon shared the views of the mainstream science community, stating that there is “unanimous agreement in the scientific community that a temperature increase of this magnitude would bring about significant changes in the earth’s climate,” and that Exxon’s findings were “consistent with the published predictions of more complex climate models.”²⁸

Industry documents from the 1980s provide further evidence that Exxon and other Defendants internally acknowledged that the threat of climate change was real, it was caused by fossil fuels, and it would have significant impacts on the environment and human health. Notably, a 1982 corporate primer—circulated internally to Exxon management—recognized the need for “major reductions in fossil fuel combustion” in

²⁷ Memo from R. W. Cohen to A.M. Natkin, Exxon Research and Engineering Company 1 (Sept. 2, 1982), <https://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/1982-exxon-memo-summarizing-climate-modeling-and-co2-greenhouse-effect-research>.

²⁸ *Id.* at 2.

order to mitigate global warming. In the absence of such reductions, “there are some potentially catastrophic events that must be considered . . . [O]nce the effects are measurable, they might not be reversible[.]”²⁹

The 1982 Exxon primer predicted a doubling of CO₂ concentrations (above pre-industrial levels) by 2060 and increased temperatures of 2 to 4°C (above 1982 levels) by the end of the 21st century. It also provided a detailed assessment of the “potentially catastrophic” impacts of global warming.³⁰ From 1977 to 2003, Exxon scientists reported global warming projections averaging $0.2^{\circ} \pm 0.04^{\circ}\text{C}$ per decade.³¹ Observed global temperature changes have proven Exxon’s projections to be startlingly accurate.³²

A 1988 Shell report issued similar warnings to those from Exxon: “by the time the global warming becomes detectable it could be too late to take effective countermeasures to reduce the effects or even to

²⁹ Memo from M.B. Glaser to Exxon Management re CO₂ “Greenhouse” Effect, *supra* note 19, at 2 and 11.

³⁰ *Id.* at 12-14.

³¹ Geoffrey Supran, Stefan Rahmstorf, and Naomi Oreskes, *Assessing ExxonMobil’s Global Warming Projections*, 379 *Science* 1, 5 (2023), <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abk0063>.

³² *Id.* at 4, Fig. 2.

stabilise the situation.”³³ Acknowledging the need to consider policy changes, the report provided that “the potential implications for the world are . . . so large that policy options need to be considered much earlier” and that research should be “directed more to the analysis of policy and energy options than to studies of what we will be facing exactly.”³⁴

The Shell report made detailed projections of the likely impacts of global warming, including the melting of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet, which could result in global sea level rise of 5 to 6 meters. It also predicted the “disappearance of specific ecosystems or habitat destruction,” and an increase in “runoff, destructive floods, and inundation of low-lying farmland.” The report predicted that changes in global atmospheric temperature would “drastically change the way people live and work.”³⁵

³³ R.P.W.M Jacobs et al., *The Greenhouse Effect*, Shell Internationale Petroleum Maatschappij B.V., The Hague 1, 4 (May 1988), <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4411090-Document3.html#document/p9/a411239>.

³⁴ *Id.* at 4 and 9.

³⁵ Benjamin Franta, *Shell and Exxon's secret 1980s climate change warnings*, The Guardian (Sept. 19, 2018), <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per->

In 1989, Shell produced a confidential report titled “SCENARIOS 1989 – 2010,” which outlined a low-emissions “sustainable world” scenario, in which emissions peak around 2000 and decline thereafter, and a high-emissions “global mercantilism” scenario, in which emissions double by 2050.³⁶ Under “global mercantilism” (the emissions path we are currently on), Shell predicted “[t]here would be more violent weather – more storms, more droughts, more deluges. Mean sea level would rise at least 30 cm.”³⁷ Even more alarming, the report concludes that “[b]oundaries would count for little . . . Conflicts would abound. *Civilisation could prove a fragile thing.*” (Emphasis added).³⁸

In the 1970s and 1980s, Defendants pursued cutting-edge research and amassed considerable data on climate change. This body of research confirmed their earlier knowledge, and led to the undeniable conclusion that continued fossil fuel production and use would lead to

[cent/2018/sep/19/shell-and-exxons-secret-1980s-climate-change-warnings](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/23735737-1989-oct-confidential-shell-group-planning-scenarios-1989-2010-challenge-and-response-disc-climate-refugees-and-shift-to-non-fossil-fuels) (citing The Greenhouse Effect, Shell International).

³⁶ SCENARIOS 1989 – 2010, Shell Group Planning (Oct. 1989) 36, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/23735737-1989-oct-confidential-shell-group-planning-scenarios-1989-2010-challenge-and-response-disc-climate-refugees-and-shift-to-non-fossil-fuels>.

³⁷ *Id.* at 5.

³⁸ *Id.*

irreversible and catastrophic climate change. Armed with this information, Defendants faced a turning point.

II. DEFENDANTS TOOK PROACTIVE STEPS TO CONCEAL THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND DISCREDIT CLIMATE SCIENCE

Despite acknowledging that increased CO₂ concentrations due to fossil fuel combustion posed a considerable threat, Exxon, Shell, and other Defendants decided not to take steps to prevent the risks of climate change. Instead, they stopped pursuing internal climate research, and launched campaigns to discredit climate science and delay actions perceived as contrary to their business interests.³⁹

Defendants carried out these campaigns by: (1) developing public relations strategies that were contradictory to their knowledge and scientific insights, (2) engaging in public communications campaigns to promote doubt and downplay the threats of climate change, and (3) funding individuals, organizations, and research aimed at discrediting the growing body of publicly available climate science.

³⁹ Memo from A.M. Natkin to H.N. Weinberg re CRL/CO₂ Greenhouse Program, Exxon Corporation 1 (June 18, 1982), <https://insideclimatenews.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Budget-Cutting-Memo-1982.pdf>.

A. Defendants developed sophisticated public relations strategies to hide the risks of climate change and create doubt about the scientific consensus of global warming.

Defendants responded to public policy efforts to address the dangers of their products by concealing and denying the known hazards, in contradiction to earlier internal acknowledgments and statements made by industry scientists and executives.

In a 1988 internal memo, Exxon acknowledged that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were increasing and could double in 100 years, that the combustion of fossil fuels was emitting five billion gigatons of CO₂ per year, and that the “[g]reenhouse effect may be one of the most significant environmental issues for the 1990s.”⁴⁰ But in this same memo, Exxon identified that its position would be to “[e]mphasize the uncertainty in scientific conclusions regarding the potential enhanced Greenhouse effect[.]”⁴¹

Shell followed suit. In contrast to Shell’s 1988 report that recommended the prompt consideration of policy solutions, a 1994

⁴⁰ Memo from Joseph Carlson to DGL re The Greenhouse Effect 2 (Aug. 3, 1988), <http://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/566/>.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 7.

internal report focused on scientific uncertainty, noting that the “postulated link between any observed temperature rise and human activities has to be seen in relation to natural variability, which is still largely unpredictable.” Shell asserted that “[s]cientific uncertainty and the evolution of energy systems indicate that policies to curb greenhouse gas emissions beyond ‘no regrets’ measures could be premature, divert resources from more pressing needs and further distort markets.”⁴²

Industry associations and groups, such as the Global Climate Coalition (GCC), exerted significant influence on the industry, inter alia, through their communications strategies.⁴³ Established in 1989, the GCC identified itself as “an organization of business trade associations and private companies . . . to coordinate business participation in the scientific and policy debate on the global climate

⁴² P. Langcake, *The Enhanced Greenhouse Effect: A Review of the Scientific Aspects*, Shell Internationale Petroleum Maatschappij B.V. 17 (Dec. 1994), <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4411099-Document11.html#document/p15/a411511>.

⁴³ See generally Robert Brulle, *Advocating inaction: A historical analysis of the Global Climate Coalition*, Environmental Politics (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2022.2058815>.

change issue.”⁴⁴ But in reality, the group opposed greenhouse gas regulation through lobbying, funding of front groups, denial and disinformation campaigns, and other tactics.

In 1996, the GCC developed a primer that provided an overview of the group’s position on climate change. While acknowledging that the planet was warming, the GCC claimed that humankind’s role was “very small”:

The GCC believes that the preponderance of the evidence indicates that most, if not all, of the observed warming is part of a natural warming trend which began approximately 400 years ago. If there is an anthropogenic component to this observed warming, the GCC believes that it must be very small and must be superimposed on a much larger natural warming trend.⁴⁵

This statement not only stands in contradiction to the internal memos and peer-reviewed papers published by Defendants’ own scientists but also to the final internal draft of the GCC primer itself, which stated that the “scientific basis for the Greenhouse Effect and the potential impacts of human emissions of greenhouse gases such as CO₂

⁴⁴ *Global Climate Coalition: An Overview*, Global Climate Coalition 1 (Nov. 1996), <http://www.climatefiles.com/denial-groups/global-climate-coalition-collection/1996-global-climate-coalition-overview/>.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 2.

on climate is well established and cannot be denied.”⁴⁶ This language was removed by the GCC before final publication. The final draft also concluded that contrarian theories failed to “offer convincing arguments against the conventional model of greenhouse gas emission-induced climate change,”⁴⁷ which was also removed before final publication.

As their memoranda and statements show, Defendants undertook a deliberate shift toward a strategy of uncertainty and delay that contradicted their own prior research.

B. Defendants engaged in public communications campaigns designed to manufacture doubt and downplay the threats of climate change.

Communications efforts aimed at the general public were a key part of Defendants’ strategy. Defendants, individually and through their membership in trade associations, launched campaigns that directly contradicted earlier statements recognizing a general scientific consensus on climate change and the magnitude of its effects.

⁴⁶ Memo from Gregory J. Dana to AIAM Technical Committee re Global Climate Coalition (GCC) – Primer on Climate Change Science – Final Draft, Association of International Automobile Manufacturers 5 (Jan. 18, 1996), <http://www.climatefiles.com/denial-groups/global-climate-coalition-collection/global-climate-coalition-draft-primer/>.

⁴⁷ *Id.*

In 1996, Exxon issued a publication titled “Global warming: who’s right? Facts about a debate that’s turned up more questions than answers,” in which Exxon CEO Lee Raymond stated that “taking drastic action immediately is unnecessary since many scientists agree there’s ample time to better understand climate systems[.]” The publication characterized the greenhouse effect as “unquestionably real and definitely a good thing,” and as “what makes the earth’s atmosphere livable.” Directly contradicting the company’s internal reports and peer-reviewed science, the publication attributed the increase in global temperature to “natural fluctuations that occur over long periods of time” rather than to anthropogenic sources.⁴⁸

Also in 1996, API published “Reinventing Energy: Making the Right Choices,” a book that stated that “there is no persuasive basis for forcing Americans to dramatically change their lifestyles to use less oil.” The book denied the human connection to climate change, stating that no “conclusive—or even strongly suggestive—scientific evidence exists

⁴⁸ *Global warming: who’s right? Facts about a debate that’s turned up more questions than answers*, Exxon Corporation 5 (1996), <http://www.climatefiles.com/exxonmobil/global-warming-who-is-right-1996/>.

that human activities are significantly affecting sea levels, rainfall, surface temperatures or the intensity and frequency of storms.”⁴⁹

In addition to these public statements, Defendants developed, implemented and/or funded public affairs programs, aimed at shifting “America’s social consciousness” by targeting specific people or groups with tailored messages.⁵⁰ From 1972 through 2014, Mobil and Exxon ran advertorials (paid advertisements styled like op-eds or editorials) in *The New York Times* and other national newspapers.⁵¹ They bought these advertorials because they wanted the “public to know where [they] stand” on climate change and other issues.⁵²

In a 2017 peer-reviewed study, Dr. Supran and Dr. Oreskes compared Exxon’s internal and peer-reviewed scientific papers to its

⁴⁹ Sally Brain Gentile et al., *Reinventing Energy: Making the Right Choices*, American Petroleum Institute 77 (1996), <http://www.climatefiles.com/trade-group/american-petroleum-institute/1996-reinventing-energy/>.

⁵⁰ See e.g. *Evolution of Mobil’s Public Affairs Programs 1970-81*, Mobil 2, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/5396414-Reduced-Evolution-of-Mobil-Public-Affairs-Program.html>.

⁵¹ *Exxon and Mobil Ads*, Polluter Watch, <http://polluterwatch.org/exxon-and-mobil-ads>.

⁵² Mobil, *CNN and the value of instant replay*, New York Times (Oct. 16, 1997), <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/705559-mob-nyt-1997-oct-16-cnnslam.html>.

non-peer-reviewed external public communications on climate change (including 36 *Times* advertorials from 1989 to 2004), finding a stark contrast between the two. Dr. Supran and Dr. Oreskes found that 83% of peer-reviewed papers and 80% of internal documents acknowledged that climate change is real and human-caused, compared to only 12% of advertorials. Instead, 81% of advertorials emphasized doubt.⁵³

Similarly, an industry-funded organization called the Information Council on the Environment (ICE) launched a national climate denial campaign (ICE was formed and supported by affiliates, predecessors and/or subsidiaries of Defendants).⁵⁴ ICE's primary strategy was to "reposition global warming as theory (not fact),"⁵⁵ an acknowledgement

⁵³ Supran and Oreskes, *supra* note 18, at 1.

⁵⁴ Among others, members included: Western Fuels Association, National Coal Association, Edison Electric Institute, Island Creek Coal Company (subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum), Peabody Coal Company, and Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining (subsidiary of Chevron). Kathy Mulvey and Seth Shulman, *The Climate Deception Dossiers: Internal Fossil Fuel Industry Memos Reveal Decades of Corporate Disinformation*, Union of Concerned Scientists 22 (July 2015), <https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2015/07/The-Climate-Deception-Dossiers.pdf>.

⁵⁵ Letter from Dr. Patrick Michaels, Information Council on the Environment 9 (May 15, 1991), <http://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2015/07/Climate-Deception-Dossier-5-ICE.pdf>.

that global warming had previously been accepted as fact within the scientific community.

In 1996, API created the Global Climate Science Communications Team (GCSCT), which included representatives of fossil fuel companies, public relations firms, and industry front groups with the mission of undermining the global scientific consensus on climate change was real and human caused. In 1998, the GCSCT developed a multi-million-dollar, multi-year action plan to “inform the media about uncertainties in climate science,” and ultimately ensure “there are no further initiatives to thwart the threat of climate change[.]”⁵⁶

In contrast to what industry scientists acknowledged for more than two decades, the API action plan declared that “it not [sic] known for sure whether (a) climate change actually is occurring, or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.”⁵⁷ The memo articulated the association’s intent to undermine the scientific

⁵⁶ *Global Climate Science Communications Team Action Plan*, American Petroleum Institute 4 (Apr. 3, 1998), <http://www.climatefiles.com/trade-group/american-petroleum-institute/1998-global-climate-science-communications-team-action-plan/>.

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 1.

consensus on climate change, stating that “Victory Will Be Achieved When”:

Average citizens ‘understand’ (recognize) uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the ‘conventional wisdom.’⁵⁸

Representatives of Exxon, Chevron, and other Defendants contributed to the development of the plan, which identified an array of industry trade associations, front groups, fossil fuel companies, and free market think tanks that would underwrite and execute elements of the plan.

C. Defendants funded individuals, organizations, and research to discredit the growing body of publicly available climate science.

As Martin Hoffert, an Exxon scientist who authored several of Exxon’s peer-reviewed papers on the CO₂ greenhouse effect, said:

Even though we were writing all these papers which were basically supporting the idea that climate change from CO₂ emissions was going to change the climate of the earth according to our best scientific understanding, the front office, which was concerned with promoting the products of the company, was also supporting people that we call climate change deniers . . . they were giving millions of dollars to other entities to support the idea that the CO₂ greenhouse [effect] was a hoax.”⁵⁹

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 3.

⁵⁹ Westervelt, *supra* note 16, Episode 2, The Turn (interview with Martin Hoffert at 11:07) (Nov. 15, 2018).

Defendants advanced these arguments and contrarian theories as a means to manufacture public uncertainty and undermine climate science. For example, Exxon, API, Southern Company, and other fossil fuel interests funded Harvard-Smithsonian aerospace engineer Dr. Wei-Hock Soon to publish and promote research asserting that solar variability is the primary cause of global warming, even though the GCC had internally dismissed this theory as “unconvincing.” Between 2001 and 2012, Soon received more than \$1.2 million from the fossil fuel industry, including Defendants, to conduct research purported to be independent and promote climate change theories that Defendants knew were not supported by the peer-reviewed scientific literature, including publications by their own scientists.⁶⁰

In addition, Defendants funded industry front groups that denied and sought to discredit climate science. From 1998 through 2019, Exxon spent at least \$37 million funding 69 organizations that misrepresented and persistently sought to discredit the scientific consensus that Defendants’ fossil fuel products were causing climate

⁶⁰ Mulvey and Shulman, *supra* note 54, at 6.

change.⁶¹ In June 2021, Exxon senior director of federal relations Keith McCoy admitted as much when he stated that the company “aggressively [fought] against some of the science” by using third party “shadow groups.”⁶²

In 2007, Exxon pledged to stop funding climate denier groups.⁶³ However, in direct contradiction to this public commitment and more recent statements acknowledging that “climate change is real and [Exxon is] committed to being part of the solution,”⁶⁴ the company has continued to fund individuals and groups that spread climate disinformation or obstruct policy efforts to address global warming.⁶⁵

⁶¹ *ExxonMobil Foundation & Corporate Giving to Climate Change Denier & Obstructionist Organizations*, Union of Concerned Scientists (2019), <https://ucs-documents.s3.amazonaws.com/clean-energy/exxon-mobil-grants-1998-2019.pdf>.

⁶² Lawrence Carter, *Inside Exxon’s Playbook: How America’s biggest oil company continues to oppose action on climate change*, <https://unearthed.greenpeace.org/2021/06/30/exxon-climate-change-undercover/>.

⁶³ *2007 Corporate Citizenship Report*, ExxonMobil 39 (2007), <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2799777-ExxonMobil-2007-Corporate-Citizenship-Report.html>.

⁶⁴ Suzanne McCarron, *A Better Approach on Climate Change*, ExxonMobil (Jan. 10, 2018), <https://energyfactor.exxonmobil.com/perspectives/better-approach-climate-change/>.

⁶⁵ Riley Dunlap and Aaron McCright, *Organized Climate Change Denial*, *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society* (2011),

From 2008 through 2019, Exxon spent more than \$14 million funding think tanks and lobby groups that reject established climate science, spread disinformation, and oppose the company's public positions on climate policy,⁶⁶ a clear indication that Exxon continues to fund climate science disinformation through third-party individuals and organizations to this day.⁶⁷

III. DEFENDANTS MOVED TO PROTECT THEIR OWN ASSETS FROM CLIMATE RISKS BASED ON THE SCIENCE THEY PUBLICLY DISCREDITED

While promoting public campaigns to undermine climate science and block policy action on climate change because the science was “too uncertain”, Defendants took affirmative steps to protect their own assets from climate risks through internal research, infrastructure improvements, and plans to exploit new reserves in a warming world.

<https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566600.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566600-e-10>.

⁶⁶ *ExxonMobil Foundation & Corporate Giving to Climate Change Denier & Obstructionist Organizations*, *supra* note 61.

⁶⁷ Pattanun Achakulwisut et al., *Ending ExxonMobil Sponsorship of the American Geophysical Union* (Mar. 2016), <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2803702-AGU-Report-Final-20160325.html>.

In 1989, Shell announced that its engineers were redesigning a \$3 billion North Sea natural gas offshore platform to protect against sea level rise,⁶⁸ raising the 1.5 million metric ton structure by one to two meters at a cost of \$16 million per meter.⁶⁹

In 1994, when planning the Europipe project jointly owned and operated by Shell, Exxon, Conoco, Total, and Statoil, the companies took sea level rise and other climate impacts into account in the design of the natural gas pipeline leading from a North Sea offshore platform to the German coast. In a document submitted to European authorities, the companies noted the impacts of sea level rise and the likely increase in frequency of storms as a result of climate change. While recognizing climate change as a “most uncertain parameter,” they determined that the pipeline should be designed to account for climate impacts.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Amy Lieberman and Susanne Rust, *Big Oil braced for global warming while it fought regulations*, Los Angeles Times (Dec. 31, 2015), <http://graphics.latimes.com/oil-operations/>.

⁶⁹ *Greenhouse Effect: Shell Anticipates A Sea Change*, New York Times (Dec. 20, 1989), <https://www.nytimes.com/1989/12/20/business/greenhouse-effect-shell-anticipates-a-sea-change.html>.

⁷⁰ Lieberman and Rust, *supra* note 68.

In 1996, Mobil, Shell, and Imperial Oil (now majority owned by Exxon) took similar steps to protect their investments in the Sable gas field project off the coast of Nova Scotia, Canada. Company engineers designed and built a “collection of exploration and production facilities along the Nova Scotia coast that made structural allowances for rising temperatures and sea levels.”⁷¹ As described in the design specifications, “[a]n estimated rise in water level, due to global warming, of 0.5 meters may be assumed” for the 25-year life of the Sable gas field project.⁷²

As described above, Defendants took steps to protect their own assets from climate change, while concealing and denying the climate dangers caused by their products and blocking policies that could have protected the public from those same dangers.

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

IV. DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO MISLEAD AND DECEIVE THE PUBLIC THROUGH GREENWASHING AND OTHER MISREPRESENTATIONS

Although Defendants no longer use the same tactics of outright climate denial, they continue to deceive the public through greenwashing and other deceptive practices.

In 2022, a congressional investigation by the U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform revealed that Defendants' commitments to reduce emissions and tackle the climate crisis are misleading and not supported by their actions. Internal industry documents show that BP, Chevron, Exxon, and Shell "have tried to create the impression that they are taking ambitious steps to reduce emissions—without actually doing so" and have used "accounting gimmicks, tricky language, and delay tactics to claim the mantle of climate leadership while continuing to be a primary cause of an ongoing climate catastrophe."⁷³

⁷³ House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Memorandum Re: Investigation of Fossil Fuel Industry Disinformation 2-3 (Sept. 14, 2022), <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/2022.09.14%20FINAL%20COR%20Supplemental%20Memo.pdf>.

In a separate investigation, the U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources found that Defendants rely heavily on public relations firms, which use misleading advertising to “help oil and gas companies avoid having to take real action on the climate crisis, or stop others from doing so.”⁷⁴ Between 2016 and 2018, BP, Chevron, Exxon, Shell, and Total spent nearly \$195 million annually on climate-related advertising campaigns,⁷⁵ several of which mislead consumers about the impacts of their products. For example, Chevron’s *Energy Challenge*,⁷⁶ Exxon’s *Natural Gas PB&J*,⁷⁷ and API’s *We’re on it*⁷⁸ campaigns disingenuously promote natural gas as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions,

⁷⁴ House of Representatives, Committee on Natural Resources, *The Role of Public Relations Firms in Preventing Action on Climate Change 1* (Sept. 14, 2022),

<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II15/20220914/115094/HHRG-117-II15-20220914-SD007.pdf>.

⁷⁵ InfluenceMap, *Big Oil’s Real Agenda on Climate Change 10* (Mar. 2019), <https://influencemap.org/report/How-Big-Oil-Continues-to-Oppose-the-Paris-Agreement-38212275958aa21196dae3b76220bdde>.

⁷⁶ Chevron, *The Power of Human Energy*, <https://www.chevron.com/stories/the-power-of-human-energy>).

⁷⁷ ExxonMobil, *Nat Gas PB&J*, <https://twitter.com/exxonmobil/status/1202616524437180417>.

⁷⁸ American Petroleum Institute, *Natural Gas Solutions: We’re On It!*, <https://www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/natural-gas-solutions>.

despite the fact that natural gas is a significant source of CO₂ and methane.

In their most recent high-profile campaign, Defendants have announced widely publicized commitments to the Paris Climate Accord to achieve “net zero” emissions, typically by the year 2050, in a clear effort to appear committed to solving climate change. These commitments have been roundly discredited in academic literature,⁷⁹ investor analyses,⁸⁰ and a wide range of independent assessments.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Mei Li, Gregory Trencher and Jusen Asuka, *The clean energy claims of BP, Chevron, ExxonMobil and Shell: A mismatch between discourse, actions and investments*, PLOS ONE 17(2): e0263596 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263596>.

⁸⁰ Global Climate Insights, *Initiation of coverage: BP* (2022), <https://www.accr.org.au/research/initiation-of-coverage-bp/>; Engine No. 1, *Reenergize ExxonMobil: Investor Presentation* (2021), <https://assets.contentstack.io/v3/assets/bltc7c628ccc85453af/bltab8cd50fae615bf1/6131f287504fe365615e557d/Engine-No.-1-Reenergize-ExxonMobil-Investor-Presentation.pdf>; Follow This, *Investor Briefing* (2021), <https://www.follow-this.org/investor-briefing/>.

⁸¹ Climate Action 100+, *Net Zero Company Benchmark* (2022), <https://www.climateaction100.org/net-zero-company-benchmark/>; Carbon Tracker, *Company Profiles* (2022), <https://carbontracker.org/company-profiles/>; World Benchmarking Alliance, *Oil and Gas Benchmark: Measuring the 100 most influential companies on their progress to 1.5°C* (2021), <https://www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org/publication/oil-and-gas/>.

Multiple independent analyses have confirmed that BP,⁸² Shell,⁸³ and Chevron⁸⁴ will increase emissions by 2030, despite their highly publicized “net zero” ambitions. Yet, Defendants and their executives continue to publicly promote these pledges, even as they walk back plans to expand renewable energy investments and instead increase production of oil and natural gas.⁸⁵

V. CONCLUSION

Defendants had actual knowledge of the risks associated with their fossil fuel products as early as the late 1950s and no later than 1968. Despite their knowledge and expertise on climate science, Defendants promoted the use of their products to District of Columbia residents through fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive practices. In taking these actions, Defendants violated D.C.’s consumer protection

⁸² Global Climate Insights, *Initiation of coverage: BP*, *supra* note 80.

⁸³ Global Climate Insights, *Initiation of coverage: Royal Dutch Shell* (2021), <https://www.accr.org.au/research/initiation-of-coverage-royal-dutch-shell-rds-1/>.

⁸⁴ World Benchmarking Alliance, *supra* note 81.

⁸⁵ Will Mathis, *Europe’s Oil Giants Slow Green Goals and Act More Like Exxon*, Bloomberg (Feb. 8, 2023), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-02-08/in-the-struggle-for-big-oil-s-soul-the-american-vision-wins-out#xj4y7vzkg>.

statute, as alleged by Plaintiff, and therefore should be held liable in D.C. court. Amici urge this Court to affirm the decision below.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of April, 2023.

By: s/ Alison S. Gaffney

KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

Alison S. Gaffney

Daniel P. Mensher

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200

Seattle, WA 98101-3052

Tel: (206) 623-1900

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**D.C. Cir. Case Number 22-7163**

I am the attorney or self-represented party.

This brief contains **6,465 words**, excluding the items exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f). The brief's type size and typeface comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and (6).

I certify that this brief is an amicus brief and complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5).

s/ Alison Gaffney _____

Alison Gaffney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**D.C. Cir. Case Number 22-7163**

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing/attached **Brief of Amici Curiae Robert Brulle, Center for Climate Integrity, Chesapeake Climate Action Network, Justin Farrell, Benjamin Franta, Stephan Lewandowsky, Naomi Oreskes, Geoffrey Supran, and the Union of Concerned Scientists in Support of Plaintiff-Appellee and Affirmance** on this date with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit using the Appellate Electronic Filing system.

s/ Alison Gaffney _____

Alison Gaffney