

Supporting Information for Supply Chain Linkages and the Extended Carbon Coalition

Jared Cory[†], Michael Lerner[‡] and Iain Osgood[§]

Abstract

Which firms oppose action to fight climate change? Networks of input-sourcing and sales to downstream customers ought to propagate and reinforce opposition to decarbonization beyond direct emitters of CO₂. To test this claim, we build the largest dataset of public political activity for and against climate action in the US, revealing that the majority of corporate opposition to climate action comes from outside the highest-emitting industries. We construct new measures of the carbon-intensity of firms and show that policy exposure via carbon-intensive inputs and sales to downstream emitters explains this large volume of opposition from non-emitting industries. 66% of US lobbying on climate policy has been conducted by this extended coalition of firms, associations, and other groups that have publicly opposed reducing carbon emissions. Public opposition to climate action by carbon-connected industries is therefore broad-based, highly organized, and matched with extensive lobbying.

[†]PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. Haven Hall, 505 S. State St, Ann Arbor MI 48104; jcory@umich.edu.

[‡]PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science and Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan. Haven Hall, 505 S. State St, Ann Arbor MI 48104; lernerm@umich.edu.

[§]Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. Haven Hall, 505 S. State St, Ann Arbor MI 48104; iosgood@umich.edu.

Contents

- Appendix A: Ad hoc coalitions and lobbying** **2**
- Group identification 2
- Quote selection 3
- Quote position coding 4
- Group position coding 5
- Replication data for group position coding 6
- Groups excluded 85
- Lobbying key words and bills 87

- Appendix B: Additional Models** **89**
- 4-digit Industry Fixed Effects 90
- Intensity of opposition to climate action 92
- IV results 96
- Carbon intensity and opposition among utilities and utility suppliers 99
- Outliers and firms that hedge 101

FOR ONLINE PUBLICATION ONLY

Appendix A: Ad hoc coalitions and lobbying

This subsection provides an overview of the methodology by which we identified and coded the positions of the ad hoc coalitions contained in the data. We then present replication data for coding each group's position.

Group identification

We used a variety of sources to identify the ad hoc climate coalitions examined in this analysis, namely white papers, blogs, and other grey literature, coalition membership lists, media reports, and internet searches. We used five publications as our point of departure: 1) "Countermovement coalitions: Climate denialist organizational profiles," a November 2018 report from the Climate and Development Lab at Brown University,¹ 2) "Policy coalitions in the global greenhouse: Contestation and collaboration in global climate change policy," by Ian M. McGregor,² 3) "Organising to influence the global politics of climate change," by Ian M. McGregor,³ and 4) *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming*, by Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway,⁴ and 5) "Desmog", a blog dedicated to reporting on global warming misinformation campaigns.⁵ We extracted the ad-hoc climate change coalitions referenced by these publications and then used a "snowballing" approach to identify additional groups by examining membership lists of referenced groups.

We used three criteria to identify ad hoc climate coalitions. First, these groups were required to have a mission primarily relating to climate change and public policy. Second, the groups had to be membership-based

¹ Jones, Caroline, Cartie Werthman, Daniel Motley, Cole Triedman, and Mara Dolan. November 2018. "Countermovement coalitions: Climate denialist organizational profiles," Climate and Development Lab at Brown University. Available at <http://www.climatedevlab.brown.edu/uploads/2/8/4/0/28401609/covercountermovementcoalitions.2.2019.pdf> Accessed on November 11, 2019.

² McGregor, Ian M. 2009. "Policy coalitions in the global greenhosue: Contestation and collaboration in global climate change policy" (Doctoral dissertation). Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10453/20224> Accessed on November 11, 2019.

³ McGregor, Ian M. 2008. "Organising to influence the global politics of climate change," Proceedings of the 22nd ANZAM Conference, pp. 1–15. Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10453/11492> Accessed on November 11, 2019.

⁴ Oreskes, Naomi; Conway, Erik M. 2010. *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming*. Bloomsbury Press.

⁵ Desmog Blog. 2006–Present. "Desmog: Clearing the PR pollution that clouds climate science." (Website). Available at <https://www.desmogblog.com> Accessed November 11, 2019.

organizations. Finally, the group's membership had to include firms. Our approach identified a total of 118 groups, 26 of which were excluded due to failing to meet at least one of the criteria.⁶ We excluded a further nine groups for which we were unable to find membership information. After completing the group identification process, we were left with 83 climate change-related ad-hoc groups with private-sector members and accessible membership lists.

Our “snowballing” approach provides a replicable procedure for collecting coalitions because many coalitions are members of other coalitions. When these coalition co-memberships are represented in a network graph, 61 of the coalitions we identified form a single cluster of coalitions connected by at least one co-membership tie. As a result, locating a few centrally located coalitions in this cluster ensures the identification of the remaining coalitions by examining membership lists. The remaining 22 coalitions were not themselves a member of any other coalition.

We supplemented this list via keyword searches on the Google internet search engine, as well as archives of articles published by the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*.⁷ Finally, we searched for references to climate change-related groups on the “Influence & Lobbying” pages of the Center for Responsive Politics’ website, OpenSecrets.org.⁸

Quote selection

In order to identify group positions toward climate change mitigation policy, we collected three representative quotes for each group. We visited each group’s website and collected quotes from its homepage, “About us” webpage, and publications relating to climate change policy, including reports, blog posts, and press releases. We collected three quotes for each group that, so far as possible, approximately spanned the duration of a group’s existence.⁹ For groups that are no longer active or that have changed their webpages over time, we used the Internet Archive to access cached versions of group webpages and publications. A small number of quotes (N=5) were also collected from historical documents in the authors’ collection.

All of the quotes used to code group positions on climate change mitigation are reproduced in the subsection at the end of this Appendix. Primary sources for these quotes are available from the authors upon request.

⁶ For example, the BlueGreen Alliance (<http://www.bluegreenalliance.org>) consists only of unions and corporations.

⁷ Keywords used include, among others, “climate change”, “global warming”, “group”, “coalition”, “statement”, “spokesman”, “press release”, “policy”, “skeptic”, “climate action”, and “lobby”.

⁸ Center for Responsive Politics. 1996–Present. “OpenSecrets.org” (Website). Available at <https://www.opensecrets.org/> Accessed November 11, 2019.

⁹ For one group, we could only find two quotes.

Quote position coding

After collecting up to three quotes for each group, we coded each quote in terms of its position toward climate change mitigation. Quotes were assessed with reference to a rubric consisting of four attributes favorable, four attributes opposed, and two attributes neutral to the enactment of climate mitigation policy. These attributes are listed in Table A1. Full quote coding information is available from the authors upon request.

Table A1: Attributes of quotes favorable, opposed, and neutral to climate change mitigation policy

Position	Quote attribute
Favorable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for mitigation or renewable energy policy - References supportive of mainstream climate change science, drivers, and impacts - Recognition of need for/engagement in joint action for climate change mitigation - Expressions of urgency, concern, or alarm about climate change
Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neutral statements regarding climate change mitigation or renewable energy policy - References to electricity efficiency and energy productivity
Opposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposition to mitigation or renewable energy policy (incl. broadly anti-regulation) - Expressions of support for expanded fossil fuel development and utilization - Arguments that climate policies threaten energy balance, reliability, and affordability - Expressions of uncertainty or skepticism of mainstream climate science, drivers, and impacts

Quotes received one of five codes according to its combination of quote attributes. These codes are: ‘strongly favorable,’ ‘weakly favorable,’ ‘neutral,’ ‘weakly opposed,’ and, ‘strongly opposed.’ The rules for aggregating quote attributes to quote codes are presented in Table A2.

Table A2: Coding rules from quote attributes to quote codes

Quote code	Coding rule	Example (F-N-O)
Strongly favorable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only Favorable attributes - Twice as many Favorable than Neutral AND no Opposed 	2-0-0 2-1-0
Weakly favorable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fewer than twice as many Favorable than Neutral AND no Opposed - A plurality of Favorable - Favorable equal to Neutral AND fewer Opposed than Favorable 	1-2-0 2-1-1 2-2-1
Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only Neutral - More Neutral than Favorable AND more Neutral than Opposed - Favorable equal to Opposed 	0-1-0 1-2-1 2-1-2
Weakly opposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fewer than twice as many Opposed than Neutral AND no Favorable - A plurality of Opposed - Opposed equal to Neutral AND fewer Favorable than Opposed 	0-2-1 1-1-2 1-2-2
Strongly opposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only Opposed - Twice as many Opposed than Neutral AND no Favorable 	0-0-2 0-1-2

Each of the 247 quotes collected were coded separately by two of the researchers. There was good agreement between the two coders at the quote level. (80.2% agreement, Krippendorff's $\alpha = 0.864$.)¹⁰

Group position coding

Next, we used the quote codes to code all 83 ad-hoc climate coalitions in terms of their positions toward climate mitigation policy. Quote codes were assigned to numerical values ('strongly favorable' = 2, 'weakly favorable' = 1, 'neutral' = 0, 'weakly unfavorable' = -1, 'strongly opposed' = -2) and a mean quote code was calculated for each group. Group codes were then rounded to nearest whole number. We also created a coarser group coding that collapses to a three-level measure ('favorable' = (2,1), 'neutral' = (0), 'opposed' = (-1,-2)). These two sets of group codes yielded the distributions shown in Table A3.

Table A3: Distribution of group climate positions (N=83 coalitions)

Group climate position		Number of coalitions
3-level	5-level	
Favorable	Strongly favorable	40
	Weakly favorable	9
Neutral	Neutral	7
Opposed	Weakly opposed	3
	Strongly opposed	24

There was good intercoder agreement for 5-level group codes (72.3% agreement, Krippendorff's $\alpha = 0.886$) and excellent intercoder agreement for 3-level group codes (90.4% agreement, Krippendorff's $\alpha = 0.929$).

¹⁰Krippendorff, K. 2011. Computing Krippendorff's Alpha-Reliability. https://repository.upenn.edu/asc/_papers/43 Accessed November 11, 2019.

Replication data for group position coding

This subsection provides the names and basic metadata on the ad hoc coalitions contained in the data, as well as the quotes used to code group positions. For each group, we provide:

1. A name and identifying acronym used in the data.
2. The years of activity of the group and the years for which we sample membership. The years active are a best guess based on activity on the coalition's webpage, from mentions in the press, and from information on the coalition's webpage. We endeavor to sample membership roughly every three years where possible. This is often not achievable if, for example, a group goes for years without posting membership on their website. If membership is drawn from a work of journalism rather than the coalition's own website or materials, we notate this with a 'j' at the end of the year.
3. The total number of members in the group and a break down of members by coarsely defined type. The types are corporation; trade association; peak association; ad hoc coalition; non-governmental organization (NGO); governmental organization (Government); inter-governmental organization (IGO); union; and a residual category called 'other.' Types are broken down and reported only if they are more than 4 percent of the coalition's membership and exceed one.
4. An indicator of the geographic scope of the groups (international, national, state/regional). Note that state and national groups may include foreign firms, but none are not mainly composed of foreign firms.
5. A short description of the group's main focus. We place 'Climate' first if the group has a significant focus on climate change.
6. The group's general position on action to mitigate climate change, determined as per the procedure described above. Group position codes are, 'strongly favorable,' 'weakly favorable,' 'neutral,' 'weakly opposed,' and, 'strongly opposed.'
7. Quotes used to code the position of the group on climate change.

Apollo Alliance (aa)

Active: 2003-2010. Member years: 2004; 2007; 2010.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Apollo Alliance Project offers a bold vision to catalyze the transition to a clean energy economy that will put millions of Americans to work in a new generation of high-quality green jobs. Inspired by the visionary Apollo space program, we promote investments in the clean energy economy. Working with our coalition of labor, business, environmental and community leaders we will reduce carbon emissions and oil imports, spur domestic job growth and position America to thrive in the 21st Century economy.”¹¹
2. “The Apollo Alliance was conceived in the aftermath of the 9/11 attack by Dan Carol, a policy specialist and consultant, who turned to Joel Rogers of the Center on Wisconsin Strategy and Bob Borosage, of the Institute for America’s Future. The three recruited Bracken Hendricks, now a senior fellow at the Center For American Progress, to be the founding executive director with the goal of unifying a broad-based constituency behind a first-of-its kind economic strategy. The organization set out to convince the United States that investments in clean energy technology and sustainable infrastructure would reduce the nation’s dependence on fossil fuels and create millions of good jobs in America’s unfolding clean energy economy.”¹²
3. “Energy is the lifeblood of a modern economy. And America’s future prospects will depend upon the secure supply of affordable and sustainable energy that can fuel our continued growth and prosperity. But growing dependence on foreign oil, unprecedented energy failures, and mounting evidence of accelerating environmental problems are clear warning signs that America’s current policies cannot be sustained. It is time for a bold initiative – with the vision and the scope of the original Apollo program – to end America’s dependence on foreign oil and create millions of good jobs building the sustainable energy system of the next century.”¹³

Americans for Affordable Climate Policy (aacp)

Active: 2008-2010. Member years: 2008.

Scope: National.

¹¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20120130164832/http://apolloalliance.org/about/mission/1/30/2012>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²<https://web.archive.org/web/20081021053840/http://apolloalliance.org/about/mission/10/21/2008>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹³https://web.archive.org/web/20081023042834/http://www.apolloalliance.org/downloads/resources_ApolloReport_022404_122748.pdf 2/24/2004. Position: Strongly favor.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Coal-dependent electric companies are joining forces to do battle on pending climate-change legislation... Americans for Affordable Climate Policy is a new nonprofit organized by energy producers Ameren, Duke Energy, Southern Co., Dominion, and American Electric Power. The group wants to make sure that any cap-and-trade system Congress creates doesn’t require carbon-emitting industries to buy all of their credits at auction, but instead initially hands out some free credits to industry. Having to purchase all credits, the producers argue, would drive up costs too much for their customers. The group, which is actively recruiting rural electric co-ops, energy-intensive industries, and chambers of commerce from affected areas, has hired a team of lobbyists at Dutko Worldwide led by Andrew Wright, former chief of staff to Rep. Rick Boucher, D-Va. -Julie Kosterlitz.”¹⁴
2. “Also on the list is “Americans for Affordable Climate Policy,” a front group formed by coal interests to ensure that any cap-and-trade system gives free emissions credits to industry.”¹⁵
3. “Americans for Affordable Climate Policy operates as a public advocacy organization. The Organization attempts to ensure that any cap-and-trade system does not require carbon-emitting industries to buy all of their credits at auction. Americans for Affordable Climate Policy employs the lobbying services of outside firms to aid in its efforts.”¹⁶

American Business for Clean Energy (abce)

Active: 2010-Present. Member years: 2011.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and clean energy.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “American Businesses for Clean Energy (ABCE) is a coalition of large and small businesses that have declared their support for Congressional enactment of clean energy and climate legislation that will signif-

¹⁴Julie Kosterlitz. “From the K Street Corridor”. National Journal. 5/23/2008. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁵<https://www.prwatch.org/news/2009/04/8347/corporate-think-tank-dives-water-policy> 4/28/2009. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁶<https://www.bloomberg.com/profile/company/0543351D:US> 11/5/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

icantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Any company or business association, large or small, can add their voice to ABCE.”¹⁷

2. “Christopher Van Atten, spokesperson, American Businesses for Clean Energy, said: “The business case for a vigorous EPA enforcing well designed and efficient Clean Air Act rules is clear. We support policy measures that will create new economic opportunities and drive the transition to a clean energy economy. This includes support for the adoption of effective federal climate legislation, EPA regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, and regulation of NOx, SO2, mercury, and other hazardous air pollutants from power plants and industrial sources. Business leaders need long-term policies that will provide the foundation for economic growth and prosperity. Blocking, delaying or weakening the Clean Air Act will only serve to set us back as we strive to build a new, strong and innovative economy.”¹⁸
3. “The President made a BIG commitment Sunday to prioritize climate change this term despite Congressional opposition. He has his work cut out...and our support.”¹⁹

Americans for Balanced Energy Choices (abec)

Active: 2000-2008. Member years: 2008.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and coal energy.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Electricity runs our computers, our kitchen appliances, our televisions and radios. It charges our cell phones and helps us surf the Internet. It powers our businesses and industries, our schools and hospitals. Electricity enhances our quality of life, making us safer and more comfortable. Since electricity is essential to living and working in the modern world, it is important to understand where America gets its electricity. Half of our electricity comes from coal: Coal provides half of America’s electricity generation and more than twice as much as the next-highest contributor – nuclear. Just as modern life is unimaginable without electricity, so is the notion that we could meet our growing energy needs without coal. Coal is our most abundant fuel: The United States has more coal than any other fuel. A quarter of all of the known coal in

¹⁷<http://www.americanbusinessforcleanenergy.org/11/25/2016>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁸<http://www.americanbusinessforcleanenergy.org/2016/11/25/press-release/12/15/2010>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁹<https://www.facebook.com/American-Businesses-For-Clean-Energy-217174936086/1/23/2013>. Position: Strongly favor.

the entire world is here in America, and large coal deposits can be found in 38 states. In fact, we've got more coal than the rest of the world combined has oil. At the current rate of consumption, we are capable of meeting domestic demand for more than 200 years. We are committed to making coal a clean energy source. Commitment is more than a word – it requires action. That is why over the past 30 years, America's coal-based electricity providers have invested over \$50 billion in technologies to reduce emissions – while at the same time providing affordable, reliable electricity to meet growing energy needs.”²⁰

2. Photograph of an electrical cord plugged into a lump of coal.²¹
3. Video posted on ABEC Facebook page by a visitor of a student group saying, “clean coal.”²²

American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment (acaupcc)

Active: 2008-2015. Member years: 2010; 2013.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “We, the undersigned presidents and chancellors of colleges and universities, are deeply concerned about the unprecedented scale and speed of global warming and its potential for large-scale, adverse health, social, economic and ecological effects. We recognize the scientific consensus that global warming is real and is largely being caused by humans. We further recognize the need to reduce the global emission of greenhouse gases by 80% by mid-century at the latest, in order to avert the worst impacts of global warming and to reestablish the more stable climatic conditions that have made human progress over the last 10,000 years possible...”²³
2. “The American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) released its 2008 Annual Report, showing building momentum on comprehensive action towards clean energy and greenhouse gas pollution reductions in higher education as well as the beginning of a shift to training students and

²⁰<https://web.archive.org/web/20071102043041/http://www.americaspower.org/Issues-Policy/11/2/2007>. Position: Strongly oppose.

²¹<https://www.facebook.com/18584846727/photos/a.442089611727/18584886727/?type=1&theater> 8/24/2010. Position: Strongly oppose.

²²https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V8404r-mQ_E&fbclid=IwAROXvcQQWTEtZHEzm3n5MhobVSTrHxqkLdEFVoGSNu9oQQXH0 6/27/2008. Position: Strongly oppose.

²³<https://web.archive.org/web/20150706184617/http://www.presidentsclimatecommitment.org/about/commitment> 7/6/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

faculty to confront climate change. More than 620 schools in every state, representing nearly one third of the US student population, have signed the Commitment. ... 'As the national debate on climate finally moves in a positive direction after years of neglect, leaders in higher education are inspiring the rest of society to address the critical challenge of global climate disruption by reducing emissions on campus and by starting to re-orient the education of the nation's future professionals,' said Dr. Anthony D. Cortese, President of Second Nature, one of the ACUPCC's supporting organizations."²⁴

3. "The American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment and its almost 700 signatories have demonstrated a profound and positive impact in negating the effects of climate change and integrating sustainable practices on their campuses since the initiative's inception in 2007, according to Celebrating Five Years of Climate Leadership, the ACUPCC's five-year report. The report quantifies the progress of the initiative, which represents an agreement between nearly 700 colleges and universities to promote sustainability through teaching and action. These actions includes reducing carbon emissions on their campuses; deploying sustainable practices; revising their curriculums and cultures to raise awareness of sustainability in students and graduates; sponsoring research and developing best case practices; and engaging local economies and communities."²⁵

American Coalition for Clean Coal Energy (accce)

Active: 2008-Present. Member years: 2011; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and coal energy.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. "The American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE) is the only national trade organization whose sole mission is to advocate at the federal and state levels on behalf of coal-fueled electricity and the coal fleet. To carry out our mission, we engage constructively with elected and appointed officials, policy makers, regulators, stakeholders, and the public. Our membership is comprised of major industries — electricity generators, coal producers, railroads, barge operators, and equipment manufacturers — involved

²⁴https://web.archive.org/web/20111012124037/http://www2.presidentsclimatecommitment.org/documents/08_annual_report_released_09.pdf 1/1/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20130211015535/http://secondnature.org:80/news/five-year-report.html> 6/25/2012. Position: strongly favor.

in generating electricity from coal.”²⁶

2. “Following the Senate’s passage of S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24, joint resolutions disapproving of two final rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency for new and existing power plants, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity commended Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and West Virginia Senator Shelley Moore Capito for their leadership on the issue. The resolutions would effectively nullify EPA’s newly-proposed guidelines and standards for carbon emissions, and would ensure the rules shall have no force or effect. ‘Leader McConnell and Senator Capito’s stout defense of the everyday Kentuckians, West Virginians and those that depend on affordable and reliable energy nationwide cannot be lauded enough’ said Mike Duncan, president and CEO of ACCCE. ‘We look forward to similar House efforts to provide a unified voice in opposition of this illegal rulemaking.’ Analysis of EPA’s proposed rule estimates American consumers and businesses will pay a staggering \$30 billion or more per year in compliance costs while reaping no meaningful environmental benefits. ‘The economic costs associated with these burdensome rules cannot be justified in exchange for ineffectual environmental benefits,’ continued Duncan. ‘The damage inflicted upon not only our energy grid’s reliability, but the pocketbooks of everyday Americans, will spread far beyond what is tenable.’”²⁷
3. “In the last few weeks, we have witnessed a momentous change in the outlook for our nation’s coal-based electricity fleet. With the election of President Trump, and the pending confirmation of Scott Pruitt as head of the Environmental Protection Agency, there is new hope that the EPA will turn away from regulatory policies that would have imposed enormous costs on electricity ratepayers with very little environmental benefit in most cases. ... For example, the “Clean Power Plan,” would have usurped the authority of the states to decide which electricity sources are best for their citizens. While this regulation was intended to reduce the effects of climate change, it would have reduced sea level rise by only the thickness of two sheets of paper and, according the agency’s own analysis, would have cost \$8 billion per year. Coal-fired power plants provide reliable and affordable electricity for 48 states. President Trump and General Pruitt’s policies will ensure that these plants can continue to operate cleanly and reliably.”²⁸

²⁶<http://www.americaspower.org/about-accce/6/12/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁷https://web.archive.org/web/20161012012027/http://www.americaspower.org/press_release/accce-commend-senate-for-measures-to-block-burdensome-climate-regulations/11/17/2015. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁸<http://www.americaspower.org/new-administration-new-hope-nations-coal-fleet/1/27/2017>. Position: Strongly oppose.

American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (aceee)

Active: 1980-present. Member years: 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. "ACEEE was founded in 1980 by leading researchers in the energy field. Since that time, the United States has made significant strides in improving energy efficiency across all sectors of the economy. Yet enormous savings opportunities remain. We are working to overcome barriers and accelerate the pace of efficiency gains to help consumers, create jobs, grow the economy, enhance energy security, increase resilience, and mitigate climate change."²⁹
2. "As the new administration moved to roll back standards for cars and light trucks, ACEEE defended them, highlighting their multiple benefits. We calculated that the standards would save the owner of an average 2025 car more than \$1,000 over the vehicle's lifetime at the same time as it reduced emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants. We helped defend the fuel efficiency rule for heavy trucks, testifying before regulators and providing analysis for advocates."³⁰
3. "Consumers and businesses throughout the nation are facing heating bills two or three times higher than those last winter. California is facing an electricity reliability crisis that could cripple the state economy. Power plants, transmission lines, and natural gas pipelines are stretched to their limit in many states. And U.S. oil imports surged to around \$120 billion last year, nearly \$440 of imported oil for every American. Is this the time to scale back national energy efficiency programs?"³¹

American Council on Renewable Energy (acore)

Active: 2001-Present. Member years: 2006; 2012; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Renewable energy.

²⁹<https://aceee.org/about-us> 10/28/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

³⁰<https://aceee.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2018-ar-web.pdf> 1/1/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

³¹<https://aceee.org/press/2001/02/administration-considering-cutting-energy-efficiency-rd-and-deployment-programs-fy2002> 2/15/2001. Position: Neutral.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “ACORE is focused on the accelerated transition to a renewable energy economy that America needs to meet Paris climate goals. Our analysis suggests that the U.S. federal government’s prior climate goals for 2025 (now reaffirmed through United States Climate Alliance) remain achievable, despite reduced regulation of greenhouse emissions through a 50 percent reduction in power sector emissions. The accelerated expansion of renewable energy is essential for achievement of this ambitious emissions reduction target. To achieve a 50 percent reduction in power sector greenhouse emissions by 2025, we focus on strategically promoting the most viable measures that facilitate growth and investment for renewables and enabling technologies, including carbon pricing or other stable long-term policies that incentivize innovation and investment in carbon-free electricity generation.”³²
2. “‘The renewable energy industry is one of the fastest growing sectors in the nation’s economy, creating jobs while helping America become cleaner and more secure,’ said Dan Reicher, interim President & CEO of ACORE and Executive Director of the Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy & Finance at Stanford University. ‘I believe strongly that the growth of renewables in this country is inevitable. The issue is not whether, but how renewables succeed; technology by technology, company by company, state by state – and how quickly and at what cost. We need to continue to update policies, at both the federal and state levels, that encourage additional investment to drive the industry forward. Our country is in the midst of an energy transformation, and increasingly affordable and reliable renewables are helping to lead the way.’ ... ACORE, a 501(c)(3) non-profit membership organization, is dedicated to building a secure and prosperous America with clean, renewable energy. ACORE seeks to advance renewable energy through finance, policy, technology, and market development and is concentrating its member focus in 2015 on National Defense & Security, Power Generation & Infrastructure, and Transportation.”³³
3. “In these comments, this broad group of energy industry associations notes that most of the comments submitted initially by an unprecedented volume of filers, including grid operators whose markets would be impacted by the proposed rule, urged FERC not to adopt DOE’s proposed rule to provide out-of-market financial support to uneconomic coal and nuclear power plants in the wholesale electricity markets overseen by FERC. Just a small set of interests – those that would benefit financially from discriminatory pricing that

³²<https://acore.org/policy/6/12/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

³³<https://acore.org/acore-forum-highlights-key-role-policy-driving-renewable-energy-growth/4/23/2015>. Position: Strongly favor.

favors coal and nuclear plants – argued in favor of the rule put forward by DOE in its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, or NOPR. But even those interests – termed “NOPR Beneficiaries” by the energy associations – failed to provide adequate justification for FERC to approve the rule, and their specific alternative proposals for implementing the bailout of these plants were just as flawed as the DOE plan, according to the energy industry associations. ‘The joint comments filed today with partners across the energy spectrum reflect the overwhelming majority view that this proposed rulemaking by FERC is unprecedented and unwarranted,’ said Todd Foley, Senior Vice President, Policy & Government Affairs, American Council on Renewable Energy.”³⁴

Advanced Energy Economy (aee)

Active: 2012-present. Member years: 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Advanced Energy Economy (AEE) is a national association... making the global energy system more secure, clean, and affordable. Advanced energy encompasses a broad range of products and services... Among these are energy efficiency, demand response, energy storage, natural gas electric generation, solar, wind, hydro, nuclear, electric vehicles, biofuels and smart grid. It’s all the innovations that make the energy we use more secure, clean, and affordable.”³⁵
2. “AEE is taking its message of a pragmatic, business-focused approach to energy tax policy to Capitol Hill and beyond and it’s resonating. In those meetings, AEE offered its four core principles for federal energy tax reform. Our proposal was described as a smart and thoughtful third way by Rep. Chris Van Hollen of Maryland, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, and praised by Speaker John Boehner’s senior staffer. ... Our formal comment letter to the Ways & Means Committee on tax reform also got attention in the press, with AEE characterized as seeking to chart a middle path toward stable energy tax policy by Energy & Environment Daily.”³⁶

³⁴<https://acore.org/energy-industry-associations-tell-ferc-doe-proposal-subsidize-coal-nuclear-power-plants-unsupported-record-throw-costly-wrench-electricity-markets/> 11/7/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

³⁵<https://www.aee.net/about/aee-2/28/2019>. Position: Neutral.

³⁶<https://blog.aee.net/aee/bid/265885/dc-update-aee-takes-energy-tax-policy-reform->

3. “As President Obama delivers his final State of the Union address, we can say that the state of advanced energy is strong, said Graham Richard, CEO of Advanced Energy Economy, a national business association. The global advanced energy market was \$1.3 trillion in 2014, as big as the worldwide clothing market, and \$200 billion in the U.S., which is equal to pharmaceuticals. Both advanced energy markets are growing at double-digit rates. With the Paris agreements, the Clean Power Plan, and the market certainty provided by some of the tax credits extended by Congress, advanced energy will continue to grow, in the U.S. and around the world. We are on the way toward a prosperous world running on secure, clean, affordable energy. ... Advanced Energy Economy is a national association of businesses that are making the energy we use secure, clean, and affordable. Advanced energy encompasses a broad range of products and services that constitute the best available technologies for meeting energy needs today and tomorrow. AEE’s mission is to transform public policy to enable rapid growth of advanced energy businesses. AEE and its State and Regional Partner organizations are active in 26 states across the country, representing more than 1,000 companies and organizations in the advanced energy industry.”³⁷

Alliance for Energy and Economic Growth (aee)

Active: 2001-2005. Member years: 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and energy development.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “If America’s needs for oil and natural gas are to be met, there is no choice except to migrate into new areas for exploration and production.”³⁸
2. “Congress Should Not Regulate Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Emissions During debate on S. 14, the Senate’s Energy Policy Act of 2003, Senators Lieberman and McCain may offer an amendment to cap carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions and to impose a mandatory reporting requirement of greenhouse gases on business and industry. Regulating CO₂ would harm our nation’s economy; threaten U.S. jobs and competitiveness; raise

to-the-hill 4/18/13. Position: Neutral.

³⁷<https://www.aee.net/articles/statement-of-graham-richard-ceo-of-advanced-energy-economy-on-president-obama-s-state-of-the-union-address-2> 1/12/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

³⁸<https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/alliance-energy-economic-growth-oil-gas-drilling-ANWR-march%20-2003.pdf> 3/1/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

energy and electricity prices for consumers; and further exacerbate supply and demand imbalances in natural gas markets. In addition, mandating new federal greenhouse gas (GHG) data collection would be an unnecessary and costly burden.”³⁹

3. “Congress Should Not Mandate New Greenhouse Gas Reporting Several bills have been introduced in the 108th Congress that would create a new mandatory greenhouse gas collection and reporting regulatory system to be administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency(EPA). (See S. 17, Daschle-Jeffords; S. 139, Lieberman-McCain; H.R. 1245, Olver.) These bills are complicated and lengthy proposals. Moreover, they have not undergone the scrutiny of Senate or House hearings to determine their need, the potential costs to the government and affected entities and persons, and the paperwork burdens on the U.S. economy.”⁴⁰

Advanced Energy Management Alliance (aema)

Active: 2014-present. Member years: 2015; 2016; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Distributed generation.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “What are the benefits of distributed energy resources? ...They facilitate integration of clean and renewable energy resources; and they reduce the need for fossil fuel generation, enabling the electric grid to become more environmentally friendly.”⁴¹
2. “The Advanced Energy Management Alliance (AEMA) noted today that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) included demand response as both a greenhouse gas compliance and reliability tool in the Clean Power Plan, released on August 3. ‘We are pleased with the outcome in the final rule,’ said Katherine Hamilton, Executive Director of AEMA. ‘AEMA filed extensive comments and analytic data during the rulemaking process, urging EPA to consider demand response as one of the solutions for states to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We believe the EPA fairly considered our arguments and subsequently added it

³⁹<https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/alliance-energy-economic-growth-global-warming-%202002.pdf> 5/1/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁴⁰<https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/alliance-energy-economic-growth-greenhouse-gas-reporting-may-2003.pdf> 5/1/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁴¹<http://aem-alliance.org/> 3/1/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

to the final rule.”⁴²

3. “The Advanced Energy Management Alliance, and several member companies, met at the White House with other innovative leaders in demand response, energy storage, and renewable energy. Each company committed to deploying technologies that would build on partnerships to enhance a flexible, efficient, clean, and reliable 21st century power grid. ‘We commend the Obama Administration and those companies that have stepped up to make commitments,’ said Katherine Hamilton, Executive Director of AEMA. ‘Our demand response providers and consumers believe that competitive markets, transparent processes, and data access will be critical to ensuring that these commitments can be met and that energy consumers have choices enabling them to take advantage of clean energy and cost reduction programs, such as demand response.’”⁴³

Alliance for Climate Strategies (afcs)

Active: 2003-2008. Member years: 2003; 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Alliance for Climate Strategies is a broad-based advocacy coalition of industry sectors created to exemplify the principle that voluntary actions are an effective means of reducing [sic] greenhouse gas emissions, and demonstrate that the ingenuity and technological expertise of American industry can achieve meaningful reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.”⁴⁴
2. “On February 12, 2003, the Administration announced the first commitments under the President’s Climate VISION initiative (or “Voluntary Innovative Sector Initiatives: Opportunities Now”). These commitments will help achieve the policy goal of an 18% reduction in the intensity of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2012. The cooperative emissions management agreements entered into by members of the Alliance for Climate Strategies and others collectively cover approximately 90% of all U.S. industrial green-

⁴²<https://aem-alliance.org/advanced-energy-management-alliance-touts-demand-response-as-tool-in-clean-power-plan/> 8/5/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

⁴³<https://aem-alliance.org/aema-members-join-industry-leaders-white-house-summit-smart-energy-markets-commit-flexible-electric-grid/> 6/16/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

⁴⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20070418141108/http://www.allianceforclimatestrategies.com:80/> 4/18/2007. Position: Weakly favor.

house gas emissions. Clearly, voluntary emissions programs are working, and U.S. industry leads all other sectors of the American economy in the effort to achieve the Climate VISION intensity reduction goal.”⁴⁵

3. “Climate Policy Options: 1 - Impose costly and punitive cap-and-trade programs 2 - Do nothing 3 - Provide investment incentives to develop and deploy effective technologies 3a - Create jobs 3b - Sustain economic growth 3b - Address the issue now, not later”⁴⁶

Alliance for Industrial Efficiency (afie)

Active: 2016-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency and waste heat.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “The Alliance for Industrial Efficiency is a growing coalition of business, labor, non-profit organizations, and educational institutions that educate the public and decision-makers and advocate for policies that increase U.S. manufacturing competitiveness through industrial energy efficiency, especially the use of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and Waste Heat to Power (WHP). CHP and WHP could provide 20 percent of America’s electricity while cutting emissions and slashing energy costs for U.S. manufacturers. The Alliance leads its members’ education and lobbying activities with Congress and the Administration and state policymakers, develops coordinated communications strategies, and mobilizes members and affiliates to favor expanded awareness of industrial efficiency... If CHP provided 20 percent of U.S. electric capacity, we could: Create nearly 1 million new highly-skilled technical jobs across the country; Save the United States more than 5 quadrillion Btu (Quads) of fuel annually, the equivalent of nearly half the total energy currently consumed by U.S. households; Produce 200,000 megawatts of power, equal to the capacity of 400 power plants; Reduce carbon dioxide emissions by more than 800 million metric tons per year – the equivalent of removing more than half of the current passenger vehicles from the road.”⁴⁷
2. “David Gardiner, Executive Director of the Alliance states, “The President is right to focus on the industrial sector, which is responsible for nearly one third of U.S. energy use and where efficiency opportunities

⁴⁵https://web.archive.org/web/20060827204610/http://www.allianceforclimatestrategies.com/pdfs/acs_summary.pdf 4/1/2006. Position: Strongly favor.

⁴⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20060718223013/http://www.allianceforclimatestrategies.com:80/pdfs/may20-2005-briefingprog.pdf> 5/1/2005. Position: Weakly favor.

⁴⁷<https://alliance4industrialefficiency.org/about/> 6/12/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

abound. In fact, industrial energy efficiency could supply as much energy as we currently get from nuclear power. We are particularly pleased by the Administration’s focus on combined heat and power and waste heat recovery. These technologies—“which capture waste heat from industrial processes to generate clean and efficient power”—have been around since Thomas Edison, but are seldom addressed by policymakers. The Administration’s announcement draws attention to these time-tested technologies and challenges the nation to become more competitive by making more with less.” ... The Alliance for Industrial Efficiency is a diverse coalition that includes representatives from the business, environmental, labor and contractor communities. We are committed to enhancing manufacturing competitiveness and saving energy and money through industrial energy efficiency, particularly in the form of clean and efficient CHP and WHR.”⁴⁸

3. “The undersigned businesses, labor, clean energy organizations, and environmental organizations are committed to encouraging the use of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and Waste Heat to Power (WHP) to enhance U.S. manufacturing competitiveness, increase energy efficiency, and improve the environment. ... The legislative language, which is modified from Senator Shaheen’s Heat Efficiency through Applied Technology (HEAT) Act (S. 1202), will help states develop solutions for meeting growing energy demands efficiently and economically through the use of CHP and WHP technologies. It does so without imposing any mandates or onerous requirements, ensuring that state and local regulators have the opportunity to review the guidance and, should they choose, implement practices that are tailored and in the best interest of their communities.”⁴⁹

American Sustainable Business Council (asbc)

Active: 2012-Present. Member years: 2012; 2014; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and sustainable development.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Global temperature has been on the rise, with the first decade of the 21st century the warmest on record. Overwhelmingly, scientists agree that man-made climate change is occurring. Climate events are indis-

⁴⁸https://www.dgardiner.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Alliance_PressRelease_ExecOrder_Aug2012.pdf 8/30/2012. Position: Neutral.

⁴⁹https://chpalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Heat-Act-Coalition-Support-Letter_8_11_16_Final.pdf 11/16/2016. Position: Neutral.

putably more frequent, more severe and more destructive. Yet many policymakers have avoided meaningful action to reverse these effects, sometimes claiming that addressing climate change would hamper businesses and the economy. The opposite is true. Support the Green New Deal: The Green New Deal offers an historic opportunity to combine the strengths of private industry and government to solve critical problems and put us on the path toward a sustainable economy.. Let's Put A Price On Carbon: A price on carbon is the most efficient, business-friendly way to mitigate climate change. It will reduce emissions, create competition in the energy market, spur innovation, and create jobs. Businesses support pricing carbon because it provides the flexibility to adapt over time and plan for fixed costs... State Coalition Carbon Price: As the risks of climate change become clearer, the need grows for comprehensive action to cut carbon pollution. By far the simplest and most effective action we can take is to institute a statewide carbon tax. Join our growing coalition of state-based businesses demanding a price on carbon.”⁵⁰

2. “Business leaders recognize and applaud the President and the Environmental Protection Agency for the leadership demonstrated on issuing these rules to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, while opening the door for innovation and job creation.’ said David Levine, CEO and Co-founder of the American Sustainable Business Council. ‘We look forward to working with state governors and legislatures to implement these rules.’ ... The Council www.asbcouncil.org informs policy makers and the public about the need and opportunities for building a vibrant and sustainable economy.”⁵¹
3. “Frank Knapp Jr., President and CEO, South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce and Co-Chair of ASBC, said, ‘Business organizations that oppose the Clean Power Plan are doing the bidding of the fossil fuel industry. Real world experience tells us that implementing the Plan will create jobs and grow our economy. Its decentralized approach allows each state to decide how best to reduce carbon pollution. It protects our nation’s economy from the disastrous effects of unrestrained climate change – including the dire consequences to my state’s tourism economy.’”⁵²

Alliance to Save Energy (ase)

Active: 1977-Present. Member years: 2000; 2003; 2006; 2009; 2011; 2014; 2016; 2018.

⁵⁰<https://www.asbcouncil.org/climate-energy/6/11/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁵¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20161228065231/http://asbcouncil.org:80/news/press-release/business-leaders-applaud-epa%E2%80%99s-proposed-power-plant-rules-good-business-and/6/2/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁵²<https://web.archive.org/web/20160403173020/http://asbcouncil.org:80/news/press-release/25-diverse-business-groups-defend-clean-power-plan/3/31/2016>. Position: Strongly favor.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Alliance to Save Energy devotes specific effort working on the following issues. Click on each to learn more about our work in these areas. Federal Policy: We focus on influencing and promoting effective bipartisan legislation, regulatory actions and administrative policy. Energy 2030: We bring together national and local leaders to advance implementation of a roadmap for achieving the shared goal of doubling U.S. energy productivity... Clean Power Plan: We have developed a hub of tools and resources for policy makers and industry participants to explain the role of energy efficiency as the fastest, easiest and most cost-effective mechanism available for compliance with the Clean Power Plan. Buildings: With buildings comprising approximately 40 percent of U.S. energy waste, we promote the adoption, implementation and advancement of building energy codes in the U.S. and abroad, aiming to make the most energy-exhaustive sector more efficient. CarbonCount: We have developed a scoring tool that evaluates bond investments in U.S.-based energy efficiency and renewable energy projects and now offer third-party green bond certifications in accordance with the CarbonCount methodology.”⁵³
2. “Carbon Pricing: We have seen increased bipartisan support for a carbon tax aimed at reducing carbon emissions in a market based, technology-neutral fashion. The Alliance supports a carbon tax as one of many viable policy options for driving efficiency. Carbon pricing by its very nature should encourage efficiency by putting a price on emissions. Policy design is complex, however, and legislation must be thoughtfully structured to achieve results, including through complementary policies and programs helping energy consumers realize savings.”⁵⁴
3. “EPA’s much anticipated 111(d) proposal for existing power plant carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions standards is out. While we’ve only had a first look, we’re pleased that EPA and the Administration embrace and promote energy efficiency—our cheapest, cleanest, most reliable and most readily available energy resource. ... States can also use building energy codes, industrial efficiency programs, energy service performance contracts, tax incentives, and other tools to save energy while saving money, supporting local jobs, decreasing emissions, reducing grid vulnerabilities, and modernizing buildings and industry.”⁵⁵

⁵³<https://www.ase.org/about> 6/11/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

⁵⁴<https://www.ase.org/sites/ase.org/files/2019-policy-agenda.pdf> 6/11/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁵⁵<https://www.ase.org/blog/boosting-economy-reducing-emissions-anticipated-111d->

Business Council on Climate Change (bcocc)

Active: 2008-Present. Member years: 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Business Council on Climate Change (BC3) is a San Francisco-based multi-sector partnership dedicated to incubating, scaling, and sharing world-leading solutions to address climate change.”⁵⁶
2. “In September 2018, San Francisco hosted The Global Climate Action Summit, which highlighted and accelerated aggressive climate action by states, cities, and businesses. BC3 participated in a number of events, including hosting a local “Employee Climate Champions” event, and hosting an exchange between Quebec and Bay Area business leaders around climate change innovation and corporate action.”⁵⁷
3. “The Business Council on Climate Change (BC3) is a partnership of 100+ Bay Area businesses committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions”⁵⁸

Business Council for Sustainable Energy (bcse)

Active: 1999-Present. Member years: 1999; 2002; 2005; 2008; 2012; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Renewable energy and clean energy.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The industries represented by the BCSE – energy efficiency, natural gas, and renewable energy – have had a significant role in decarbonizing the U.S. economy, supporting economic development and spurring job growth across America, and they deserve thoughtful consideration in the formation of a national climate change policy... It is critical that any greenhouse gas reduction policies are ambitious enough to effect real

standard 6/2/2014. Position: Weakly favor.

⁵⁶<https://www.bc3sfbay.org/10/28/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁵⁷<https://www.bc3sfbay.org/policy1/10/2018>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁵⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20110902115749/http://www.bc3sfbay.org/2/9/2011>. Position: Strongly favor.

change in the energy sector specifically and the U.S. economy more broadly. The findings of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change’s Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5C should be considered when setting policies and timelines necessary to avoid the worst effects of climate change... Any climate program should facilitate deployment of the full range of readily available clean energy technologies – including energy storage, renewable energy and natural gas, as well as carbon capture utilization and storage, among others. A federal climate program also should prioritize the use of energy efficiency to mitigate any growth in energy demand and fuel price volatility, and reward inclusion of energy efficiency in infrastructure investments.”⁵⁹

2. “The RES, CREBs, the ITC and energy efficiency tax provisions are essential components of a balanced national energy strategy that enhances our energy security and reliability, creates jobs and economic opportunity in the United States and provides a down payment on reducing greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global climate change,’ Jacobson affirmed. ... The Council believes that a comprehensive, forward-looking and technology-based energy future is in the interest of all Americans. The Council therefore strongly recommends that the House and Senate maintain the RES and the energy tax title in the final energy bill. These programs will have widespread and substantive benefits for consumers and business, and will put America on the road to a secure energy future.”⁶⁰
3. “The Business Council for Sustainable Energy applauds President Obama for his Administration’s efforts to reduce federal GHG emissions by increasing both energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources across federal government operations. ... The BCSE applauds the federal government for making these clean energy and energy efficiency investments amongst its own operations and encouraging this progress across the supply chain.”⁶¹

Building Decarbonization Council (bdc)

Active: 2018-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and building emissions.

⁵⁹<https://www.bcse.org/federal-policy/> 5/9/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

⁶⁰<https://www.bcse.org/bcse-calls-upon-congressional-leaders-to-include-vital-clean-energy-policies-and-tax-measures-in-comprehensive-energy-bill/> 1/1/2008. Position: Weakly favor.

⁶¹<https://www.bcse.org/bcse-statement-on-new-executive-order-to-reduce-federal-ghg-emissions/> 3/19/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Burning fossil fuels for heating and cooking poses a serious threat to our health and the planet - helping make buildings and homes the largest source of climate pollution in the world. Here in California, buildings are second only to transportation as the leading cause of climate change, but we have no clear plan to address these emissions. The BDC drives action by working with policymakers, the building industry and consumers to dispatch zero-emission lifestyle solutions - eliminating the need for fossil fuels and helping the state to slash climate pollution. Moving California’s homes and buildings off of fossil fuels will improve public health, cut climate pollution, deliver cleaner air, alleviate rising housing prices and monthly energy bills, and create a tremendous export opportunity for the state. To get there, we are activating strong leadership from communities and decision-makers, locally and statewide.”⁶²
2. “Set a goal and achieve it. It’s the most basic premise in any business or self-help guide on how to succeed. And in California, we’ve set some lofty climate goals. We said we would get back to 1990 levels of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and we did it – four years early. While California should celebrate its climate achievements so far, reaching the next phase of emissions cuts will be more difficult ... and more exciting. Successfully rising to the challenge will require a statewide, cross-sector, all-hands-on-deck effort led by an inspired Governor Newsom. Already in California we’ve made great progress in our globally-leading utility and renewable energy sectors. But the fact is, supply-side levers are easier to pull than the mass market of the demand-side. We must now inspire Californians to take the clean energy revolution into their homes and workplaces, by moving away from gas in favor of clean, electricity.”⁶³
3. “My message to Gov. Newsom is that, in our effort to cut emissions from buildings - making them healthier and cleaner, we can inspire, lead and supply a global movement. California can and must do this for two main reasons: (1) our state is extremely vulnerable to climate change and therefore we need the rest of the world to rapidly reduce climate pollution and (2) we have more climate experience, leadership and industries than any other entity to offer to the world. Prioritizing building climate solutions that we can export requires that Gov. Newsom make California a role model by adopting solutions that can be mimicked in other areas as well as creating a platform from which to engage and push other states and countries on achievements in this sector.”⁶⁴

⁶²<http://www.buildingdecARB.org/about.html> 5/21/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁶³<http://www.buildingdecARB.org/blog/building-leadership-gov-newsoms-climate-housing-and-social-justice-solution> 12/13/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

⁶⁴<http://www.buildingdecARB.org/blog/building-leadership-to-inspire-a-global->

Balanced Energy Arkansas (beark)

Active: 2013-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate, energy prices and coal energy.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “BEA will oppose any legislation that would mandate or designate preferred fuels for the generation of electricity in Arkansas. Mandating the use of one particular fuel over another would lead to higher and more volatile electric rates. Balanced Energy Arkansas (BEA) is a coalition of allied companies and organizations who are dedicated to ensuring reliable, low-cost electricity for Arkansas’s consumers, businesses, and farmers. Higher electricity prices would threaten jobs in every sector of Arkansas’s economy, and would significantly harm our state’s ability to recruit new industry and create new jobs.”⁶⁵
2. “The Obama administration is now finalizing its “Clean Power Plan” regulation to force states to drastically cut their greenhouse gas emissions — and Arkansas will be among the hardest hit. ... Proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, the regulation is essentially a federal takeover of our electricity grid. ... This will effectively force the closure of many of our state’s coal-powered energy plants — which currently provide more than half of our electricity — and force us to adopt alternative fuel sources, like wind and solar, which government data show are plainly too expensive to use on a massive scale. ... No matter what else happens, our electricity prices will skyrocket. Family utility bills will increase 14 percent every year during the regulation’s implementation, according to a recent study. And our state’s industrial rates will increase even more — 54 percent by 2020 over their 2012 levels.”⁶⁶
3. “We are writing to express our concern that the barrage of regulations coming out of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designed to end coal in American electricity generation will have a devastating effect on the health of American families. ... When looking at this analysis, the only conclusion is that Utility MACT, as well as the many other EPA rules that cost billions but yield few benefits are not about

emission-free-building-revolution-post-5-of-building-leadership-series 12/13/2018.
Position: Strongly favor.

⁶⁵<https://www.balancedenergyarkansas.org/what-we-believe/> 5/9/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁶⁶<https://www.balancedenergyarkansas.org/newsroom-events-1/> 2/2/2015. Position: Strongly oppose.

public health. They are about ending coal development and the good paying jobs it provides.”⁶⁷

Business Environmental Leadership Council (belc)

Active: 1999-Present. Member years: 2000; 2005; 2008; 2012; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “While individual companies hold their own views on policy specifics, they are united with C2ES in the belief that voluntary action alone will not be enough to address the climate challenge. In 2011, the BELC members accepted the following guiding principles: 1. We accept the scientific consensus that climate change is occurring and that the impacts are already being felt. Delaying action will increase both the risks and the costs. 2. Businesses can and should incorporate responses to climate change into their core corporate strategies... 3. The United States should significantly reduce its GHG emissions through economy-wide, mandatory approaches, which may vary by economic sector and include a flexible, market-based program. Complementary policies may also be necessary for sectors such as buildings, electricity generation, forestry, agriculture, and transportation that will help drive innovation and ease the transition to a low-carbon economy. 4. Climate change is a global challenge that ultimately requires a global solution. An international climate framework must establish fair, effective, and binding commitments for all developed and major developing economies.”⁶⁸
2. “Thirty-six major companies in the Pew Center’s Business Environmental Leadership Council, most included in the Fortune 500, work with the Center to educate the public on the risks, challenges and solutions to climate change. ... Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize two points for you today. First, it is our view that the long-term reductions of greenhouse gas emissions needed to truly address global climate change can only be achieved through a comprehensive and binding strategy. Second, we believe the steps we take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — especially those promoting the development and use of energy efficient technologies — will help U.S. industry compete in the international marketplace.”⁶⁹

⁶⁷<https://www.balancedenergyarkansas.org/newsroom-events-1/> 6/18/2012. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁶⁸<https://www.c2es.org/our-work/belc/> 5/9/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁶⁹<https://www.c2es.org/speech/congressional-testimony-of-eileen-claussen-july-10-2001/> 7/10/2001. Position: Strongly favor.

3. “On today’s introduction of carbon pricing legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives: We hear consistently from companies that a price on carbon is the most effective way to decarbonize our economy. It’s very encouraging to see this market-based approach once again drawing bipartisan support in Congress. The Market Choice Act offers Congress an excellent starting point for crafting a sensible, market-based climate solution. It demonstrates the potential fiscal benefits of a carbon price, protects low-income families, and offers a promising way to balance pricing and regulatory approaches to ensure strong climate benefits. We commend Congressman Curbelo for introducing the Market Choice Act. We and members of our Business Environmental Leadership Council look forward to working with him to move this vital conversation forward.”⁷⁰

Balanced Energy for Texas (betex)

Active: 2011-2017. Member years: 2011; 2017.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and energy development.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “The goal of energy policy should be to make the entire ‘energy pie’ bigger, not to try to force favored parts to grow or shrink... If policymakers begin to interfere with marketplace decisions by picking one fuel source over another, we can expect price distortions and supply constraints... Today, the Texas energy sector faces an increasing amount of uncertainty from intrusive and disruptive federal regulatory initiatives. Although many of EPA’s rules threaten Texas’ success, the greatest threat to Texas’ current generation mix is EPA’s so-called ‘Clean Power Plan’ – EPA’s rule to limit CO2 emissions from power plants.”⁷¹
2. “In June of last year, the EPA published a rule that attempts to regulate carbon emissions under the Clean Air Act. What does the Clean Power Plan mean for Texas? The EPA’s proposed rule would destroy the underpinnings of the ERCOT competitive electric market and is an overwhelming threat to our state, our competitive market, customer affordability, and electric reliability.”⁷²

⁷⁰<https://www.c2es.org/press-release/bob-perciasepe-on-the-introduction-of-carbon-pricing-legislation/> 7/23/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

⁷¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20160822132841/http://www.balancedenergyfortexas.org/epas-cpp-impact/> 8/22/2016. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁷²<https://web.archive.org/web/20150312034033/http://www.balancedenergyfortexas.org/newsroom/> 2/5/2015. Position: Strongly oppose.

3. “Power Grab: How The EPA’s Clean Power Plan Aims To Nationalize The Electric Grid. The EPA’s Clean Power Plan (CPP) tells 47 states and three Native American tribal nations to come up with plans to cut carbon dioxide emissions by a third or else the federal government will do it for them. The “or else” looks an awful lot like the cap-and-trade carbon emissions scheme rejected by Congress multiple times in the past decade. In any event, the CPP is an unprecedented federal power grab.”⁷³

Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (bicep)

Active: 2011-Present. Member years: 2012; 2016; 2017.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP) is an advocacy coalition of businesses committed to working with policy makers to pass meaningful energy and climate legislation that is consistent with our core principles... A rapid transition to a 21st century, low-carbon economy will create new jobs and stimulate economic growth while stabilizing our planet’s fragile climate... BICEP’s overall goal is broad, bi-partisan consensus among policy makers to reduce US greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, with an interim goal of at least 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2020. We recognize that there are a number of ways to reach this level of mitigation.”⁷⁴
2. “The Ceres BICEP Network (Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy) was founded in 2009 on the understanding that climate and clean energy challenges present tremendous opportunities, but also urgent risks for global businesses. ... Ceres BICEP Network members support three principles: increased adoption of renewable energy and energy efficiency; increased investment in a clean energy economy; and increased support for climate change resilience.”⁷⁵
3. “Five leading U.S. corporations joined with Ceres today to announce the launch of a new business coalition calling for strong U.S. climate and energy legislation in early 2009 to spur the clean energy economy and

⁷³<https://web.archive.org/web/20160513123853/http://www.balancedenergyfortexas.org/newsroom/3/30/2016>. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁷⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20160410084959/http://www.ceres.org/bicep/principles/4/10/2016>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁷⁵<https://www.ceres.org/networks/ceres-policy-network> 9/17/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

reduce global warming pollution. The group's key principles include stimulating renewable energy, promoting energy efficiency and green jobs, requiring 100 percent auction of carbon allowances, and limiting new coal-fired power plants to those that capture and store carbon emissions. ... The coalition's goal is to work directly with key allies in the business community and members of Congress to pass meaningful energy and climate change legislation consistent with the following eight core principles: Set greenhouse gas reduction targets to at least 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Establish an economy-wide GHG cap-and-trade system that auctions 100 percent of carbon pollution allowances, promotes energy efficiency and accelerates clean energy technologies. Establish aggressive energy efficiency policies to achieve at least a doubling of our historic rate of energy efficiency improvement. Encourage transportation for a clean energy economy by promoting fuel-efficient vehicles, plug-in electric hybrids, low-carbon fuels, and transit-oriented development. Increase investment in energy efficiency, renewables and carbon capture and storage technologies while eliminating subsidies for fossil-fuel industries. Stimulate job growth through investment in climate-based solutions, especially "green-collar" jobs in low-income communities and others vulnerable to climate change's economic impact. Adopt a national renewable portfolio standard requiring 20 percent of electricity to be generated from renewable energy sources by 2020, and 30 percent by 2030. Limit construction of new coal-fired power plants to those that capture and store carbon emissions, create incentives for carbon capture technology on new and existing plants, and phase out existing coal-based power plants that do not capture and store carbon by 2030."⁷⁶

Climate Action Business Association (caba)

Active: 2014-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "OUR MISSION To help solve the climate crisis by organizing local business leaders to be more effective advocates for climate action within their businesses and communities, as well as at the state, national, and even international levels. OUR VISION A new economy based on a strong, cooperative local business

⁷⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20120527234911/http://www.ceres.org/bicep/press/five-major-u.s.-companies-call-for-congressional-action-on-climate-change-clean-energy-11/19/2008>. Position: Strongly favor.

community, working together to create and maintain a resilient and sustainable future that is responding to climate change, with business leaders helping to achieve bold leadership from the local level to the international scene.”⁷⁷

2. “Tackling climate change is the greatest challenge and the greatest economic opportunity of our generation. We support enacting a price on carbon emissions, to create economic incentives for businesses and consumers to reduce fossil fuel consumption and increase adoption of cleaner alternatives. An economy-wide carbon price is the most efficient and cost-effective tool to achieve significant emissions reductions while ensuring a smooth transition to a low-carbon economy.”⁷⁸
3. “After Hurricane Sandy, 25-30% of small businesses impacted by the storm were forced to permanently close their doors. We watched as the lights went out in our nation’s economic powerhouse and storm surges overtook the city’s storefronts. Small businesses are an important part of local economies and have unique challenges when it comes to climate change preparation. If a similarly devastating storm was to strike Massachusetts, the impacts may have serious consequences for our small businesses. ... A key solution to this looming risk is passing the Comprehensive Adaptation Management Plan (CAMP) bill that currently sits before our state legislature. Last September, Governor Baker signed Executive Order 569, which allowed regions and municipalities to utilize state resources to create adaptation plans specific for their projected climate impacts. While these resources are a clear step forward in creating resilient communities in the commonwealth, passing legislation would codify planning efforts in law and create additional programs to help residents adapt. If passed, CAMP would establish a proactive, integrated, and long-term approach to ensuring our communities, economic assets, and investments are resilient against the impacts of climate change.”⁷⁹

California Business Alliance for a Clean Economy (cabace)

Active: 2014-Present. Member years: 2014; 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and energy efficiency.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

⁷⁷<https://cabaus.org/about-caba/our-process/> 4/2/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁷⁸<https://cabaus.org/2017/09/18/action-opportunity-sign-on-to-support-carbon-pricing/> 9/18/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

⁷⁹<https://cabaus.org/2017/11/02/local-businesses-need-climate-adaptation-legislation/> 11/2/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The California Business Alliance for a Clean Economy was created to amplify the business voice in support of policies to help move us toward cleaner energy, less dependence on petroleum, and to help us avoid the economic and social disruptions associated with climate change.”⁸⁰
2. “Our coalition supports the extension of the California Cap-and-Trade program because it: * Provides market certainty – and regulatory continuity – that is critical for businesses. * Reduces greenhouse gases (GHGs) at the least cost. * Results in certain, quantifiable GHG emission reductions. * Creates an opportunity to maximize investments in carbon reduction programs that create jobs and economic growth. * Complements California’s important direct emission reduction rules and laws. * Allows us to build on successes and link to markets in other jurisdictions. * Offers a flexible program that can be strengthened to generate greater emissions reductions over time if needed. * Provides revenues, when distributed appropriately, to bring clean energy investments to disadvantaged communities.”⁸¹
3. “Today, the International Council on Clean Transportation and E4tech released a report (available here) which examined what would happen if all four PCC jurisdictions adopted clean fuel standards. The report finds that doing so is feasible, from a fuel-supply perspective, and would likely result in substantial reductions in oil consumption and carbon emissions.”⁸²

Coalition for Affordable and Reliable Energy (care)

Active: 2001-2009. Member years: 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007; 2008; 2009.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and energy prices.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Continued economic growth will require increased energy consumption, especially electricity. It will be impossible to achieve energy security, meet growing energy demand and ensure economic vitality without relying on electricity from coal for a significant share of America’s energy needs. Coal is currently the source

⁸⁰<http://clean-economy.org/about-us/> 10/28/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁸¹<http://clean-economy.org/californias-job-creators-strongly-support-cap-and-trade-program-to-advance-economic-growth/> 4/27/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

⁸²<http://clean-economy.org/the-promise-of-clean-fuels-in-the-west-and-beyond/> 1/23/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

of half of this country's electricity. There are ample domestic supplies of this abundant energy resource – enough to last 250 years. And, even though the emission of air pollutants from coal-based power plants has fallen by 30 percent since 1970, the development of new and advanced clean coal technologies will allow electricity from coal to be generated even more cleanly. If America is to meet its future energy needs, which are projected to increase 45 percent by the year 2020, increasingly clean electricity from coal must continue to be a primary source of energy.”⁸³

2. “The United States must have a comprehensive energy policy that promotes greater utilization of domestic energy resources, seeks use of a variety of diverse energy sources, including coal, oil, natural gas and others, and aims for a more reasonable approach to harmonizing energy and environmental objectives.”⁸⁴
3. “As the Energy and Natural Resources Committee continues its mark-up of national energy legislation, the Coalition for Affordable and Reliable Energy (CARE) strongly urges you to oppose efforts to include a mandatory “Renewable Portfolio Standard” provision in the Senate’s bill.”⁸⁵

Corporate Climate Alliance (cca)

Active: 2018-Present. Member years: 2018; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “We need concerned corporate leaders to join us and create an intelligent, forceful, and effective voice in the worldwide campaign to reduce hydrocarbon emissions. It is important that we act now, from a position of economic strength, before the damage resulting from climate change sets back efforts to make significant progress. Given the lack of participation by the federal government, corporations have the imperative to take action independently.”⁸⁶
2. “Corporations Unite to Support Carbon Tax: How Does It Stack Up? What, you ask, has brought these

⁸³<https://web.archive.org/web/20061018182430/http://www.careenergy.com/about/index.asp> 10/18/2006. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁸⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20061018182847/http://www.careenergy.com/news/articleview.asp?iArticle=26> 2/18/2001. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁸⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20090313120831/http://www.careenergy.com/news/news2005.asp> 6/9/2005. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁸⁶<https://www.corporateclimatealliance.com/> 4/29/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

companies together at just this moment? Clearly, they all recognize the need for the US to join the rest of the world in addressing climate change. But the most likely proximal cause is President Trump's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, which has catalyzed a massive groundswell of voices at every level pushing for effective action on climate change.”⁸⁷

3. “What’s your tolerance for business risk? When will your business be affected by climate disruption? 2050? 2030? 2020? Natural disasters have been on an uptrend. How much longer can we afford to pay for this? Why accept risk when you can prevent it? Did you know that reinsurance companies are denying coverage for climate-related catastrophes? Did you know that world governments pay \$5 trillion annually in fossil fuel subsidies? We can reverse the trend. We can challenge the status quo. Become a part of CCA, the Corporate Climate Alliance. CCA is dedicated to changing this reality by bringing companies together. At the state & federal level, CCA aims to adopt a fair carbon pricing initiative for businesses, promote government funding for research and development of clean energy innovation, promote businesses that minimize their carbon footprint, shift subsidies from coal & oil to renewables. CCA is committed to reducing business risk, improving business continuity, acting while we still can. Minimize your business risk while being part of the solution. Join CCA, the Corporate Climate Alliance”⁸⁸

Climate and Clean Air Coalition (ccac)

Active: 2015-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and short-lived climate pollutants.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Coalition helps partners and stakeholders create policies and practices that will deliver substantial short-lived climate pollutant reductions over the coming decades. We support actions on the ground through 11 initiatives, and our Solution Centre provides a forum for scientists, experts and decision makers to share their expertise and trial new technology.”⁸⁹
2. “Over a dozen Ministers from countries around the world released a statement today calling for accelerated

⁸⁷<https://www.corporateclimatealliance.com/single-post/2017/07/10/Corporations-Unite-to-Support-Carbon-Tax-How-Does-It-Stack-Up> 7/10/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

⁸⁸<https://www.corporateclimatealliance.com/single-post/2016/05/26/CCA-INFORMATIONAL-VIDEO-15/26/2016>. Position: Strongly favor.

⁸⁹<http://ccacoalition.org/en/content/what-we-do> 4/2/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

action to substantially reduce venting, leakage, and flaring of natural gas from oil and gas operations worldwide. Specifically, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition intends to work with leading oil and gas companies to achieve substantial global methane and black carbon emission reductions ... The Climate and Clean Air Coalition is a voluntary global partnership of governments, intergovernmental organizations, businesses, scientific institutions and civil society committed to catalyzing concrete, substantial action to reduce Short Lived Climate Pollutants (including methane, black carbon and many hydrofluorocarbons). The Coalition has 11 initiatives working to raise awareness, mobilize resources and lead transformative actions in key emitting and cross cutting sectors. SLCP reduction must go hand in hand with deep and persistent cuts to carbon dioxide and other long-lived greenhouse gases if we are to stay under a 2 degrees Celsius warming limit.”⁹⁰

3. “In a message delivered to delegates United Nations Secretary General, Ban Ki Moon said, “The Climate and Clean Air Coalition is an impressive example of a partnership that can deliver results. We must act urgently to limit carbon dioxide emissions to keep global temperature rise below two degrees Celsius. In addition we need immediate action to control short-lived climate pollutants, not only to mitigate warming, but to reduce air pollution and improve public health.”⁹¹

Consumer Energy Alliance (cea)

Active: 2006-Present. Member years: 2007; 2009; 2012; 2017; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and oil exploration.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Our mission is to improve consumer understanding of energy security and the thoughtful development and utilization of energy resources to help create sound energy policy and maintain stable energy prices for consumers... The goal of CEA is to motivate and provide a voice for consumers interested in vital public issues, such as responsible access to available natural resources; power generation; impact of energy prices on business, agriculture and consumers; development of a robust, domestic renewable energy industry;

⁹⁰<https://ccacoalition.org/sites/default/files/press/Climate%20and%20Clean%20Air%20Coalition%20Working%20with%20Oil%20and%20Gas%20Companies%20to%20Reduce%20Methane%20and%20Black%20Carbon%20Emissions.pdf> 11/25/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

⁹¹<https://ccacoalition.org/sites/default/files/press/COP21%20HLA%20Press%20Release%20FINAL.pdf> 12/8/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

and utilization of new technologies that allow for higher levels of energy efficiency and conservation... Officially formed in early 2006, CEA has already developed a solid reputation through our successful efforts to build support for expanded U.S. offshore oil and natural gas access.”⁹²

2. “Today, Consumer Energy Alliance submitted comments to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the Proposed Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Existing Electric Power Plants. CEA believes these draft regulations could dramatically increase electricity prices for consumers and do not guarantee enough time to ensure adequate power supplies from low and no carbon sources. In order to avoid these potential problems, CEA outlined some of its concerns with the proposed rule and suggested changes that could better protect rates and ensure electricity remain reliable for our nation’s families, farms, factories and businesses.”⁹³
3. “With the United States’ continued status as the world’s largest producer of petroleum and natural gas, along with substantial gains in renewable energy development and energy efficiency, the nation is poised for long-term success in securing affordable and reliable energy and the jobs and economic activity that come with it. ... CEA has been a leading voice and advocate for ensuring access to American energy across the country, including in the Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic, and Alaskan Arctic, while also working to achieve responsible energy and environmental regulations and policies at the federal, state, and local levels. ... We work every day to ensure that Americans are not burdened by policies and actions that lead to high energy costs or unreliable energy infrastructure.”⁹⁴

Center for Energy and Economic Development (ceed)

Active: 1992-2008. Member years: 2000; 2004.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and coal energy.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

⁹²[https://web.archive.org/web/20070916163735/http://www.consumerenergyalliance.org/page.asp?g=cea&content=about 9/16/2007](https://web.archive.org/web/20070916163735/http://www.consumerenergyalliance.org/page.asp?g=cea&content=about%209/16/2007). Position: Weakly oppose.

⁹³<https://web.archive.org/web/20141209191955/http://consumerenergyalliance.org/cea-urges-epa-to-prioritize-consumer-interests-in-electricity-rulemaking/> 12/9/2014. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁹⁴<https://consumerenergyalliance.org/2018/11/consumer-energy-alliance-2018-annual-report/> 11/2/2018. Position: Strongly oppose.

1. “Abundant, affordable, and cleaner than ever: it’s no wonder that coal-based electricity provides 56% of America’s electricity. Despite its role in providing essential, affordable, and increasingly clean power, coal-based electricity has its detractors. This opposition is often based upon incorrect information or outdated beliefs. The Center for Energy and Economic Development (CEED) is a non-profit group dedicated to protecting the viability of coal-based electricity. Working at the local, state, and regional levels, CEED communicates the truth about coal-conducting research, dispelling falsehoods, and educating the public and government officials about coal-based electricity’s importance to our way of life.”⁹⁵

2. “The Commission’s decision is a major victory for CEED and other advocates of reality-based public policy. It was an even more significant defeat, however, for the many state agencies and environmental organizations that opposed admission of socioeconomic evidence for any purpose, even constitutional challenges. During oral arguments on the issue, CEED had the privilege of speaking not only for its own members, but also for those of the Western Fuels Association, the United Transportation Union, and the Transportation Communications International Union. Also arguing in support of socioeconomic evidence were Northern States Power and Otter Tail Power companies on behalf of the state’s utility sector, and the assistant attorney general of North Dakota, on behalf of that state. ... CEED will continue to serve as facilitator and coordinator of the coal, utility and labor parties.”⁹⁶

3. “Essential, affordable, and increasingly clean...Electricity from Coal is fueling America’s future. All across America, our use of electricity is growing. Over half of the electricity we use everyday comes from coal, a domestically abundant resource. Producing electricity from coal is about half the cost of using other fuels, which helps to keep energy costs affordable for American families and businesses. And thanks to investments in technologies that cut emissions and protect the environment, electricity from coal is an increasingly clean energy source.”⁹⁷

CERES (ceres)

Active: 1989-Present. Member years: 2002; 2005; 2008; 2009; 2011; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2018.

Scope: National.

⁹⁵https://web.archive.org/web/20001031064123/http://www.ceednet.org/about_ceed/index.htm 10/31/2000. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁹⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20001027190228/http://www.ceednet.org/newsletter/news119.htm> 10/31/1994. Position: Strongly oppose.

⁹⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20030929085329/http://ceednet.org/> 9/29/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

Focus: Sustainability and climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Ceres is a sustainability nonprofit organization working with the most influential investors and companies to build leadership and drive solutions throughout the economy. Through powerful networks and advocacy, Ceres tackles the world’s biggest sustainability challenges, including climate change, water scarcity and pollution, and human rights abuses.”⁹⁸
2. “We work with investors and companies to ramp up global sustainable investments in clean energy and sustainable food and water systems. Our investor network members also advocate for robust climate disclosure in financial filings and engage directly with companies to improve sustainability performance. We work with members of the Ceres Investor Network to help them better assess and mitigate climate risk in their investment portfolios. Members engage directly with companies to reduce climate-related risks, improve transparency and disclosure, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other harmful pollutants, improve water stewardship and invest in sustainable solutions. By investing more in clean energy and sustainable infrastructure, investors can help accelerate the transition to a low-carbon economy and mitigate the worst impacts of climate change. Learn more about our efforts to spur investments in a clean energy future with the Ceres Clean Trillion campaign.”⁹⁹
3. “We, the undersigned companies and investors, have a significant presence in your state and strongly support the implementation of the Environmental Protection Agency’s Carbon Pollution Standards for existing power plants. These standards, also called the Clean Power Plan, are critical for moving our country toward a clean energy economy. The Plan’s flexible approach provides an exciting opportunity for states to customize their own energy portfolio, expand clean energy solutions, attract new industries to the state, and create thousands of jobs. ... We are already experiencing increased frequency and intensity of storms, warmer temperatures, extreme precipitation, and changes in weather patterns that will continue to put trillions of dollars of institutional investors’ assets at risk and require companies to be innovative at adapting to these changes. From our positions as employers and fiduciaries, we seek a greater degree of policy certainty in order to better manage these risks in our operations, supply chains, and portfolios.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸<https://www.ceres.org/about-us> 3/11/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

⁹⁹<https://www.ceres.org/our-work/climate-change> 3/11/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁰⁰[https://www.ceres.org/sites/default/files/Letters/BICEP/PPP%20Governor%20Letter%20-%20National%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.ceres.org/sites/default/files/Letters/BICEP/PPP%20Governor%20Letter%20-%20National%20(2).pdf) 7/31/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

Coalition for Emission Reduction Projects (cerp)

Active: 2009-2011. Member years: 2009; 2010.

Scope: National.

Focus: Carbon offsets.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "CERP is a coalition of companies that develop and finance projects that reduce or sequester greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as well as companies that expect to be subject to GHG regulation and want the ability to use offset credits derived from these projects to meet their compliance obligations. We strive to provide a constructive voice in ongoing policy design efforts, including policy initiatives relating to oversight of offset credit markets and transactions in offset credits."¹⁰¹
2. "We write today to explain why we believe that a robust domestic offsets program must be a central element of any [cap and trade program]... To avoid excessive administrative complexity and cost, the emissions cap in any cap-and-trade program can only cover large sources of emissions. Within the uncapped sectors of the U.S. economy, however, there are cost-effective opportunities to reduce, destroy, avoid, and sequester greenhouse gas emissions. These opportunities can take the form of offset projects. We urge you to ensure that federal climate legislation takes full advantage of the tangible benefits offsets can offer for farmers, ranchers, forest landowners, American consumers, local ecosystems, and the global climate."¹⁰²

Coalition for American Jobs (cfaj)

Active: 2011-2013. Member years: 2010; 2011; 2012.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. "What is the Coalition for American Jobs? We represent American businesses, industries and others concerned about the impact of potential EPA action on job creation, including the growth of green jobs. Ar-

¹⁰¹CERP Comments on CFTC ANOPR September 20 2010." 9/20/2010. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁰²American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 letter including CERP members". 5/18/2009. Position: Strongly favor.

bitrary, premature EPA regulation of stationary sources of greenhouse gases would threaten the jobs and livelihoods of millions of Americans, along with the nation's economic recovery.”¹⁰³

2. “We welcome the efforts of lawmakers from both parties to stop the EPA's harmful regulations so that business growth and hiring can continue. We applaud the leadership that you and Senator Inhofe are providing on this issue through the introduction of The Energy Tax Prevention of Act of 2011(H.R. 910). This bipartisan legislation is helping to keep attention squarely focused on the issue and building momentum toward a solution.”¹⁰⁴
3. “In a rush to regulate, the Environmental Protection Agency wants to impose unworkable ozone rules that would cost business up to \$90 billion a year – threatening manufacturing and construction jobs in nearly every county in the country.”¹⁰⁵

Coalition for Vehicle Choice (cfvc)

Active: 1990-2003. Member years: 1992; 1997; 2000; 2002.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and auto regulation.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “WELCOME TO the website of the Coalition for Vehicle Choice. Thanks for stopping by. Take a look at what's new on the site. And you can find the latest information on: Air bags – The government adopts new rules for ‘advanced’ air bags – but drops the proposal for ‘aggressive’ bags that would have meant new safety risks for kids. Emissions – EPA adopts ‘Tier 2’ rules for tighter tailpipe standards and cleaner fuel, assuring that future cars and trucks will be even cleaner than today's low-emission vehicles. Fuel economy – Higher ‘CAFE’ standards restrict choice and reduce safety. Congress sided with consumers last fall by extending the freeze on CAFE, despite pressure from anti-vehicle activists. But the issue comes up again this year. Light trucks – Critics are on the attack against popular pickups, vans and SUV's. Global climate

¹⁰³<https://web.archive.org/web/20130828201532/http://coalitionforamericanjobs.com/about/8/28/2013>. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁰⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20130828204444/http://coalitionforamericanjobs.com/2011/03/u-s-industries-write-to-chairmen-upton-and-whitfield-concerning-epa%e2%80%99s-ghg-regulations/> 3/1/2011. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁰⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20130828192735/http://coalitionforamericanjobs.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/CedarRapidsGazette-01.pdf> 8/1/2011. Position: Strongly oppose.

policy – The U.N. climate treaty will hurt American motorists and consumers.”¹⁰⁶

2. “PEOPLE NEED TOW POWER! The Federal government is planning new regulations on the size and power of pickup trucks, vans and SUV’s available to the American public. The rules are corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards, set by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The government already requires new light trucks to meet an average of 20.7 mpg. DOT is now proposing to raise that requirement by nearly 10 percent over the next few years. Anti-vehicle activist groups are pressuring DOT to increase the regulation much higher – regardless of the effect on consumers. Please send a message to DOT right now! It will only take a few minutes, and your voice counts. Higher CAFE standards will likely lead to smaller trucks with less power, a reduced selection of truck models available in the marketplace, higher consumer costs, and reduced safety protection. Imagine how higher light truck CAFE standards would restrict your ability to find the right truck to tow your boat, camper, snowmobile, RV or other recreation equipment.”¹⁰⁷
3. “Climate science: How much do we know? THE EARTH’S CLIMATE has gone through many warming and cooling cycles. It’s extraordinarily complex to study, and can be measured only with reliable data over extended time periods. Climate science relies heavily on computer models that are still being refined. Some people claim there’s a scientific “consensus” that climate is changing, due to man-made emissions of greenhouse gases. But many respected voices in the scientific community believe there’s little evidence of that so far, and no reason for extreme action.”¹⁰⁸

Cooler Heads Coalition (chc)

Active: 1998-Present. Member years: 1998; 2001; 2005; 2007; 2010; 2012; 2015; 2017; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Globalwarming.org is the blog of the Cooler Heads Coalition, an ad hoc coalition of more than two dozen

¹⁰⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20000815073112/http://www.vehiclechoice.org/main.html> 8/15/2000. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁰⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20031207051003/http://www.vehiclechoice.org:80/main.html> 12/7/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁰⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20031207051003/http://www.vehiclechoice.org:80/main.html> 12/7/2003. Position: Strongly oppose.

free market and conservative non-profit groups in the U. S. and abroad that question global warming alarmism and oppose energy-rationing policies. GlobalWarming.org is one of the Coalition's principal educational outreach activities."¹⁰⁹

2. "Well, it might do just that. When in 1982, Al Haig asked Ronald Reagan why he was rejecting the Law of the Sea, Reagan replied: 'Al, that's what the last election was all about ... It was about not doing things just because that's the way they've been done before.' The Paris Agreement and the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan which is its domestic counterpart would, if implemented, damage the United States far more than the Law of the Sea ever could have done. But the answer is the same as Reagan's. Quit the whole damn shebang."¹¹⁰
3. "The report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has become the bible for those advocating immediate and heavy reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. An article which originally appeared in the New Zealand Science Review by Dr. Vincent Gray and republished by the Heartland Institute reassesses the claims made in the IPCC report. ... The article makes it clear that the IPCC took every opportunity to bias the report in favor of a predetermined conclusion. It documents many instances of selective use of data and biased interpretation of the data. At one point Gray states: 'According to the IPCC, any climate change, however short, that agrees with greenhouse theory is a long-term trend. Any climate change, however extensive, that does not agree with greenhouse theory is either ignored (like the global drop in temperature between 1940 and 1978); too short to be representative; or an anomaly that has to be explained."¹¹¹

Climate Leadership Council (clc)

Active: 2017-Present. Member years: 2017; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "The Four Pillars of Our Carbon Dividends Plan (Updated September 2019) I. A GRADUALLY RISING

¹⁰⁹<http://www.globalwarming.org/contributors/http://www.globalwarming.org/contributors/10/28/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹¹⁰<http://www.globalwarming.org/2016/11/18/sjw-day-at-cop22/11/18/2018>. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹¹¹<http://www.globalwarming.org/category/blog/page/399/10/5/1997>. Position: Strongly oppose.

CARBON FEE Economists agree that an escalating carbon fee offers the most cost-effective climate policy solution, sending a powerful price signal to steer businesses and consumers towards a low-carbon future. Accordingly, the first pillar of our bipartisan plan is an economy-wide carbon fee starting at 40 *aton*(2017) and increasing every year at 5% above inflation. If implemented in 2021, this will cut U.S. CO2 emissions in half by 2035 (as compared to 2005) and far exceed the U.S. Paris commitment. To ensure these targets are met, an Emissions Assurance Mechanism will temporarily increase the fee faster if key reduction benchmarks are not achieved. ... II. CARBON DIVIDENDS FOR ALL AMERICANS ... III. SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY SIMPLIFICATION ... IV. BORDER CARBON ADJUSTMENT ...”¹¹²

2. “I am the Chairman and CEO of the Climate Leadership Council. We launched two years ago with the release of the ‘Baker-Shultz Carbon Dividends Plan,’ co-authored by former Secretaries of State James A. Baker III and George Shultz, among other senior statesmen. We believe this plan offers the most promising basis for a much-needed bipartisan climate breakthrough. We have since assembled the broadest climate coalition in U.S. history to advance a national solution. As you can see from my first slide, our coalition includes 19 corporate sector leaders from a wide range of industries. It also includes top environmental NGOs and opinion leaders from across the political spectrum. This remarkably broad coalition is working together to develop the policy specifics of our plan. While they do not agree on every detail, they agree that our carbon dividends framework offers a consensus way forward that bridges partisan divides, strengthens our economy and protects our environment.”¹¹³
3. “Our plan, ‘The Conservative Case for Carbon Dividends,’ isn’t a stand-alone carbon tax, but rather a revenue-neutral, carbon dividends program. ... Sooner or later, the GOP will face a climate replay of the healthcare debacle now engulfing it. The only successful path to repealing a major program is by replacing it with something better. For now, the Trump administration is pursuing a repeal-only climate strategy. We are offering the GOP a replacement program that is an insurance policy for our climate, that would be considerably more effective than the Obama-era climate regulations it would replace, and is an economic support program for America’s struggling working class. Embracing carbon dividends could be a strategic bonanza for the GOP.”¹¹⁴

¹¹²<https://www.clcouncil.org/our-plan/9/17/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹¹³<https://www.clcouncil.org/media/Halstead-Testimony-Ways-Means.pdf> 5/15/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹¹⁴<https://www.axios.com/its-not-a-carbon-tax-1513301139-bfef883b-fb69-4c65-a7abe730cfc0082e.html> 3/24/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

Climate Markets and Investment Association (cmaia)

Active: 2017-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and carbon trading.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "Vision: To achieve rapid reductions in greenhouse gas emissions leading to global net zero emissions by 2050, while ensuring climate-resilient development. Mission: Our mission is to stimulate a shift in the direction and scale of private and public financial flows into investments which are consistent with the objectives of the Paris Agreement. CMIA and its members do this not only by developing the necessary investment opportunities but also by helping to establish the enabling environments needed to increase deal flow to the scale required. We recognise that this shift will only happen alongside broader efforts to achieve sustainable economic growth in line with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals."¹¹⁵
2. "Formed to represent businesses working to reduce carbon emissions through the market mechanisms of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), CMIA member companies include organizations that have been involved in an estimated 75 per cent of the value transacted in the global carbon market, worth roughly \$100 billion in 2008."¹¹⁶
3. "As the Californian Air Resources Board prepares to consider moving forward on international initiatives to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) within the state's climate policy, a large consortium of key stakeholders – from multinational corporations to a global NGOs and indigenous community leaders – have rallied in support of REDD+."¹¹⁷

Center for North American Energy Security (Center for Unconventional Fuels) (cnaes)

Active: 2007-Present. Member years: 2010.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and fossil fuels.

¹¹⁵<http://www.cmia.net/about/our-mission/> 5/22/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹¹⁶<https://www.cmia.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CMIA-Press-Release-2-August-2009-efc9ced1-f403-4c93-9d5f-6cf4317f49f1.pdf> 7/15/2009. Position: Strongly favor.

¹¹⁷<http://www.cmia.net/news/press-releases/cmia-press-release-key-global-stakeholders-sign-letters-of-support/> 7/18/2013. Position: Strongly favor.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “The objective was to create a single organization to coalesce unconventional fuels advocates in all of the affected private and governmental sectors around a unified program to advance the development and use of all of the five unconventional fuels sectors studied in the Task Force report: Heavy Oil, Tar Sands, Shale Oil, Coal-to-Liquids and Enhanced Oil Recovery.”¹¹⁸
2. “‘Ultimately, we got that deleted,’ said Tom Corcoran, executive director of the Centre for North American Energy Security. ‘And so what passed the House does not contain a low carbon fuel standard, and what is being considered in the Senate at the moment does not contain that either.’ Corcoran, a former Republican congressman, believes American prosperity depends on the active development of unconventional fuels – those such as Alberta’s oil sands that many green groups decry for huge carbon emissions.”¹¹⁹
3. “The Center’s principals were actively engaged in development of this legislation, beginning in 2002, and played a substantial role in its eventual enactment. However, the implementation of the unconventional fuels provisions in the 2005 Act has been disappointing to date. ... As a result of these developments, CNAES’s principals began a new unconventional fuels outreach program in 2007. The objective was to create a single organization to coalesce unconventional fuels advocates in all of the affected private and governmental sectors around a unified program to advance the development and use of all of the five unconventional fuels sectors studied in the Task Force report: Heavy Oil, Tar Sands, Shale Oil, Coal-to-Liquids and Enhanced Oil Recovery.”¹²⁰

Carbon Pricing Leadership Council (cplc)

Active: 2015. Member years: 2016; 2018.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and carbon trading.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

¹¹⁸“The Center for North American Energy Security: The History of the Center.” N.D.. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹¹⁹<https://thetyee.ca/News/2010/06/28/OilSandsTwistsWashington/> 4/2/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹²⁰<https://web.archive.org/web/20130926031331/http://www.petroleumequities.com/CNAEShistory.pdf> 1/1/2008. Position: Strongly oppose.

1. “What if the cost of carbon emissions was paid at the source, where choices about fuel use are made and not in the form of developmental, economic, and health costs? How would that change the incentive structure underpinning our global reliance on fossil fuels? That’s the idea behind carbon pricing. It shifts the social costs of climate change to the source of the pollution, encouraging polluters to reduce emissions and invest in clean energy and low-carbon growth.”¹²¹
2. “The Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition brings together leaders from government, private sector, academia, and civil society to share experience working with carbon pricing and to expand the evidence base for the most effective carbon pricing systems and policies.”¹²²
3. “The Paris Agreement is a major global achievement, and lays the groundwork for collective action to limit warming well below 2 degrees. Now, the world’s attention is focused on the policies and actions that can deliver on the promise of COP21, achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement, and drive greater ambition. Carbon pricing has a key role to play, as one of the most effective measures available to reduce climate pollution at the scale and pace the science demands. Carbon pricing helps ensure that the true costs of fossil fuels – and the benefits of clean energy – are reflected in the marketplace; that energy efficiency earns its full return; and that forest protection has clear economic value. A price on carbon promotes investments in cost-effective emissions reductions today while unleashing innovation in the low-carbon technologies of tomorrow. And carbon pricing supports sustainable green growth and employment in the context of a climate friendly and resilient economic transition, while generating public revenues that can be used, among other things, for broader fiscal reform or supporting climate action.”¹²³

Connecticut Sustainable Business Council (ctsbc)

Active: 2016-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “CTSBC is leading a movement! And it is a movement for a smarter government working together with the

¹²¹<https://www.carbonpricingleadership.org/3/7/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²²<https://www.carbonpricingleadership.org/partners/https://www.carbonpricingleadership.org/partners/3/7/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²³<https://www.carbonpricingleadership.org/blogs/2016/10/18/carbon-pricing-panel-setting-a-transformational-vision-for-2020-and-beyond> 4/21/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

private sector to help lower energy costs, accelerate investment in clean energy, create jobs and to confront climate challenge.”¹²⁴

2. “At a concert, it sometimes takes one brave soul to get a reluctant crowd dancing. The same is true for convincing businesses to embrace the value of sustainable practices, said Heather Burns, CEO of the fledgling Connecticut Sustainable Business Council, which held its Hartford-area launch last week in the downtown offices of law firm Shipman & Goodwin, one of its founding partners. ... Such companies still need supply chains, technologies and employees, investors and customers who are place a value on sustainability and ‘who might be willing to pay a little bit more for an environmentally or socially responsible product,’ Burns said.”¹²⁵
3. “CT Sustainable Business Council Discusses the Value of Sustainability in Business at the Center for Family Business at University of New Haven. More than 100 business leaders convened to hear panelists explore the similarities and differences between conscious capitalism and sustainability as valuable business strategies for Connecticut family businesses.”¹²⁶

Carbon Utilization Research Council (Coal Utilization Research Council) (curc)

Active: 1998-Present. Member years: 2000; 2001; 2003; 2005; 2008; 2011; 2014; 2017; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and fossil fuels.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “The Carbon Utilization Research Council (CURC) is an industry coalition focused on technology solutions for the responsible use of our fossil energy resources in a balanced portfolio to support our nation’s need for reliable and affordable energy. Created in 1998, CURC serves as an industry voice and advocate by identifying technology pathways that enable the nation to enjoy the benefits of abundant and low cost fossil fuels in a manner compatible with societal energy needs and goals.”¹²⁷
2. “The Coal Utilization Research Council supports the use of coal in the United States and worldwide and

¹²⁴<https://www.ctsbouncil.org/about/3/2/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²⁵<https://www.ctsbouncil.org/2017/05/17/ctsbc-hartford-launch-event/> 5/17/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²⁶<https://www.ctsbouncil.org/2017/06/16/conscious-capitalism-and-sustainability/> 6/16/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

¹²⁷<http://www.curc.net/about-curc> 4/2/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

advocates the formation of credible and effective partnerships between industry and government to pursue the development of technologies that will enable coal to be used economically, efficiently and in an environmentally compatible manner.”¹²⁸

3. “CURC and its members have been at the forefront of promoting the demonstration and commercial deployment of carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies.² The widespread implementation of CCS will allow the nation to continue to enjoy the economic and energy security benefits of using our vast domestic and essential U.S. coal resources while promoting reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. CURC has concerns about EPA’s proposed rule. CURC believes that the final rule should be modified to provide: (a) greater regulatory certainty for CO₂ storage in geologic formations, (b) balance between reducing the risk of potential impacts of injected CO₂ on underground sources of drinking water (or USDW), and increasing the likelihood that overly stringent UIC rules could lead to delays in the commercial adoption of CCS technology and ultimately less CO₂ mitigation, (c) a regulatory design that accommodates greater flexibility in permitting CO₂ injection, (d) interim guidance for GS projects for the period that precedes promulgation of the final UIC rule, and (e) no interference with ongoing regulatory programs that govern the commercial injection of CO₂ for enhanced oil or methane recovery. [GS = geologic sequestration of carbon dioxide]”¹²⁹

Domestic Energy Producers Alliance (depa)

Active: 2011-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Fossil fuels.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “A proactive leader in our industry. The Domestic Energy Producers Alliance is a nationwide collaboration of 33 coalition associations – from California to West Virginia, Texas to Montana – representing about 10,000 individuals and companies engaged in domestic onshore oil and natural gas exploration and production (E&P). We believe in seeking common ground, and in common sense solutions to the challenges

¹²⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20081015064432/http://www.coal.org/> 10/15/2008. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹²⁹[https://web.archive.org/web/20101227142322/http://www.coal.org/file.asp?F=CURC+Comments+on+Proposed+EPA+UIC+Rule%2Epdf&N=CURC+Comments+on+Proposed+EPA+UIC+Rule%2Epdf&C=news 12/24/2008](https://web.archive.org/web/20101227142322/http://www.coal.org/file.asp?F=CURC+Comments+on+Proposed+EPA+UIC+Rule%2Epdf&N=CURC+Comments+on+Proposed+EPA+UIC+Rule%2Epdf&C=news%2012%2F24%2F2008). Position: Weakly oppose.

that face us in our businesses, including our relationship with the federal legislative and executive branches of government. In only its tenth year, DEPA now represents a majority of the individuals and companies responsible for the current renaissance in American oil and natural gas production.”¹³⁰

2. “Due to political agendas targeting oil and natural gas production, federal and state debate over taxes, regulatory issues, and energy policy often puts the oil and gas industry in the crosshairs. Also, small vocal groups of activists across Kansas and the nation continue to work to obstruct energy development under a false belief that oil and gas production and use are incompatible with environmental progress. Mischaracterizing oil and gas activity has been and continues to be a common practice and strategy for these groups.”¹³¹
3. “DEPA is a unique grassroots approach to domestic onshore energy advocacy and education. We are an alliance of producers, royalty owners, oilfield service companies as well as state and national independent oil and gas associations representing the small businessmen and women of the energy industry. We are devoted to the survival of U.S. crude oil and natural gas exploration and production.”¹³²

Energy Institute of Alabama (eiala)

Active: 2016-Present. Member years: 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and fossil fuels.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Natural gas is clean and affordable. It has fewer impurities than most other types of fuels, which result in less pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Due to methane gas’ naturally clean state, it means that companies don’t have to purchase extra environmental controls, like scrubbers or filters. This translates to fewer expenses for the utility, which means lower bills for you and me.”¹³³
2. “Our vision is to combine Alabama’s research and development assets with our natural resources to strengthen the energy industry, to serve our customers, and to meet demands and create economic growth for our

¹³⁰<https://depausa.org/about-us/> 10/28/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹³¹<https://depausa.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/November-2018.pdf> 11/1/2018. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹³²<https://web.archive.org/web/20120422201033/http://www.depausa.org/about> 4/22/2012. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹³³<https://energyinstituteal.org/gas-is-good/> 11/5/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

state by promoting public policies that ensure reliable, affordable and clean energy for Alabamians.”¹³⁴

3. “Coal reserves are vast, and the industry is an important economic driver. Policymakers and cultural influencers must remember that coal is an engrained[sic] part of our energy mix.”¹³⁵

Energy2030 (en2030)

Active: 2013-Present. Member years: 2015; 2016;2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “Transportation: Increasing the energy productivity of moving goods and people relies on developing and deploying new technologies that increase vehicle efficiency, create more options for mass transit, and better integrate transportation needs with the built environment to reduce the demand for motorized transport.”¹³⁶
2. “This effort supports the President’s goal to double U.S. energy productivity over 2010 levels by 2030. Doubling U.S. energy productivity – or getting twice as much economic output from each unit of energy – is an ambitious, yet attainable, goal that will greatly increase the competitiveness of our economy. While increasing energy productivity will require investments in all sectors of the economy, the investments will stimulate innovation, optimize domestic industry practices, support domestic energy production and bolster job creation.[1] Doubling energy productivity means powering more homes, going more places, and running more manufacturing plants using less energy. Simply put, it means making more money and improving well-being.”¹³⁷
3. “Federal Government: Invest in long-term energy productivity through research, development, and demonstration in transportation, buildings, and manufacturing technologies; secure energy productivity through setting and updating vehicle and product codes and standards, and providing energy performance information to consumers; support policy action by state and local governments and the private sector through

¹³⁴<https://energyinstituteal.org/about/4/30/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹³⁵<https://yellowhammernews.com/coal-still-important-part-alabamas-energy-portfolio/7/8/2016>. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹³⁶<http://www.energy2030.org/wp-content/uploads/Executive-Summary.pdf> 9/16/2015. Position: Weakly favor.

¹³⁷<http://www.energy2030.org/about4/30/2019>. Position: Neutral.

the provision of tools and other resources to reap the benefits of energy efficiency; set the financial foundation for energy productivity through tax policies; help train a workforce geared for energy productivity; and lead by example in adopting new technologies and strategies in its own operations.”¹³⁸

Electric Reliability Coordinating Council (ercc)

Active: 2001-Present. Member years: 2001; 2002; 2012; 2017.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and coal energy.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “The Electric Reliability Coordinating Council is a broad-based coalition of energy companies committed to the continued viability of diverse, affordable and reliable electric power supply in the United States. Our members include some of the major electric utilities companies in the country who all possess the shared belief that coal-based energy should play an important role as our nation moves toward a clean energy future.”¹³⁹
2. “Coal remains a critical element of our base-load power picture in the United States. Coal is the largest source of electric power, representing almost 40 percent of power generation in the first half of this year. So, EPA regulations that hamper or stifle innovation in the coal-powered sector represent a profound threat to the future of energy security, electric reliability, and job creation in the United States.”¹⁴⁰
3. “We applaud President Obama’s recent commitment to an ‘all-of-the-above’ energy strategy and acknowledge his support for using a variety of energy sources to meet the nation’s energy challenges. We are concerned, however, that EPA may be seeking to use the NSPS program to impose an effective ban on new coal-fired power plants in the US. We are also concerned that, absent sufficient clarity, the proposed rule could actually discourage energy-efficiency projects at existing facilities.”¹⁴¹

¹³⁸<http://www.energy2030.org/wp-content/uploads/Executive-Summary.pdf> 9/16/2015. Position: Neutral.

¹³⁹<https://www.electricreliability.org/what-ercc> 4/30/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁴⁰<https://www.electricreliability.org/electric-reliability-coordinating-council-reacts-epa-proposal-carbon-emissions-new-coal-fired-power> 9/20/2013. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁴¹https://www.electricreliability.org/sites/default/files/media_files/ERCC%20Letter%20to%20OMB%20on%20GHG%20NSPS.pdf 3/12/2012. Position: Strongly oppose.

Global Alliance for Energy Productivity (gaep)

Active: 2015-Present. Member years: 2016; 2017; 2019.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Why three percent? Three percent annual improvement (measured as global energy intensity) represents the opportunity (analysis shows it is achievable through good policies); the necessity (it is the rate required to deliver the Paris goals); and the commitment (to meet Sustainable Development Goal 7).”¹⁴²
2. “‘While various countries are endowed with different energy resources – whether it’s oil, gas, wind, solar or hydropower – every single country has energy efficiency potential,’ said Dr Fatih Birol, the IEA’s Executive Director. ‘Efficiency can enable economic growth, reduce emissions and improve energy security. Our study shows that the right efficiency policies could alone enable the world to achieve more than 40% of the emissions cuts needed to reach its climate goals without requiring new technology.’”¹⁴³
3. “...[T]he mission of the Global Alliance is to drive continued global improvements in energy productivity... By pursuing proven policy solutions, corporations and governments around the world can: Improve economic performance and growth; Facilitate energy access around the world; Reduce greenhouse gas emissions; Drive technological innovation; Increase the reliability and security of energy infrastructure.”¹⁴⁴

Global Climate Coalition (gcc)

Active: 1989-2001. Member years: 1989; 1991; 1992; 1996; 1998; 2000.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “In the past two decades, many scientists have raised concerns about the future of the earth’s climate. In

¹⁴²<https://eeglobalalliance.org/three-percent-club> 11/5/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁴³<https://www.iea.org/newsroom/news/2018/october/energy-efficiency-is-the-answer-for-building-a-secure-and-sustainable-energy-syst.html> 8/19/2018. Position: Weakly favor.

¹⁴⁴<http://www.globalproductivity.org/about> 4/30/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

1971, several leading scientists raised concerns about global cooling, leading to predictions of a coming ice age. Some scientists still recognize a cooling potential... But scientists differ on whether the increase in the concentrations of these gases will cause an enhanced greenhouse effect, or warming of the planet. because the role of greenhouse gases in climate change is not well understood.”¹⁴⁵

2. “It is imperative that climate policies focus on responsible voluntary actions, including further research, innovation and deployment of current and potential future technologies in developed and developing nations. Unrealistic targets and timetables, such as those called for under the Kyoto Protocol, are not achievable without severely harming the U.S. economy and all American families, workers, seniors and children.”¹⁴⁶
3. “For more than a decade the Global Climate Coalition, a group representing industries with profits tied to fossil fuels, led an aggressive lobbying and public relations campaign against the idea that emissions of heat-trapping gases could lead to global warming. ‘The role of greenhouse gases in climate change is not well understood,’ the coalition said in a scientific ‘backgrounder’ provided to lawmakers and journalists through the early 1990s, adding that ‘scientists differ’ on the issue.”¹⁴⁷

Global Investor Coalition on Climate Change (gicocc)

Active: 2009-Present. Member years: 2011; 2014; 2018.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “This progress is good news, and furthering the spread of carbon pricing is essential. Putting a price on carbon reduces emissions and the costs associated with these emissions, costs that end up being borne by everyone, including companies and societies, through an array of impacts resulting from climate change. But a carbon price must provide a strong economic signal which stimulates investment in favour of low-carbon alternatives. A weak price with no long-term certainty does little to encourage low-carbon investment. This is why an effective carbon price signal is so important for investors. When conventional fuel

¹⁴⁵ GCCPressOffice ‘ ‘Backgrounder’ ’ N.D. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁴⁶ <https://web.archive.org/web/20060127223742/http://www.globalclimate.org/> 2/6/2006. Position: Weakly oppose.

¹⁴⁷ <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/24/science/earth/24deny.html?pagewanted=all&r=2> 4/23/2009. Position: Strongly oppose.

carries an appropriate cost for its emissions, low-carbon and renewable energy can compete over time on an increasingly level footing.”¹⁴⁸

2. “As institutional investors with millions of beneficiaries around the world, we reiterate our full support for the Paris Agreement and strongly urge all governments to implement the actions that are needed to achieve the goals of the Agreement, with the utmost urgency. Investors are taking action on climate change. The global shift to clean energy is underway, but much more needs to be done by governments to accelerate the low carbon transition and to improve the resilience of our economy, society and the financial system to climate risks. Investors continue to make significant investments into the low carbon transition across a range of asset classes. We are concerned that the implementation of the Paris Agreement is currently falling short of the agreed goal of ‘holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2C above preindustrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5C above preindustrial levels.’ There is an ambition gap.”¹⁴⁹
3. “Ahead of key G20 meetings in China, 130 global investors collectively managing over \$13 trillion in assets wrote to heads of state urging each G20 member country to ratify the Paris Agreement this year and to double their nations’ global clean energy investment by 2020. Investors also called for stronger climate disclosure mandates, development of carbon pricing and a phase out fossil fuel subsidies.”¹⁵⁰

Iowa Sustainable Business Alliance (iasba)

Active: 2012. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The ISBA is part of an action campaign taking place in eleven states to hold events focused on climate change... The events, co-sponsored by the American Sustainable Business Alliance, make the case for action on climate change by highlighting the potential effects and opportunities within regional business

¹⁴⁸<https://www.carbonpricingleadership.org/blogs/2015/4/3/why-investors-support-a-price-on-carbon> 7/28/2014. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁴⁹<https://globalinvestorcoalition.org/global-investor-statement-climate-change/> 5/21/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁵⁰https://globalinvestorcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/InvestorsGotTheSignal_FINAL.pdf 11/1/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

sectors. The goal with the series of events is to begin action-oriented discussions and planning to push for policies that will enable these regions and industries to successfully combat climate change. We have created a Climate Action Sign on Letter so business leaders can add their voice.”⁴⁶ The ISBA is allied with the American Sustainable Business Council, and has worked with them on a coordinated national positions on climate change.”¹⁵¹

2. “Uphold EPA Oversight of Greenhouse Gas Emissions”¹⁵²
3. “The American Sustainable Business Council (ASBC), in partnership with Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP), a project of Ceres, encourages small and mid-sized companies to sign the Climate Declaration. The Declaration makes the case that addressing climate change is not a partisan issue and offers the nation great economic opportunities. ASBC members can show their support by signing the Climate Declaration now!”¹⁵³

International Climate Change Partnership (iccp)

Active: 1996-2014. Member years: 1996; 2000; 2003; 2006; 2009; 2011; 2013.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and air pollution.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “While the ICCP has commended the inclusion of the flexibility mechanisms in the Kyoto Protocol, the group has cautioned that ratification of the agreement still requires additional work to resolve these details, as well as the negotiation of developing country commitments and establishment of a better-defined long-term objective. The International Climate Change Partnership is a coalition of US industry representatives and associations, as well as international associations, interested in the policy development process with respect to global climate change. ICCP was organized in 1991 to provide a forum to address the issue of global climate change and to be a constructive participant in the policy debate.”¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹<https://isballiance.wixsite.com/isba1/iowa-advocacy-campaigns> 3/3/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁵²<https://isballiance.wixsite.com/isba1/national-advocacy-campaigns> 11/5/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁵³<https://isballiance.wixsite.com/isba1/national-advocacy-campaigns> 11/5/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁵⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20100309042955/http://www.iccp.net/docs/principles.html> 10/26/1998. Position: Strongly favor.

2. "Since 1996 ICCP has urged that climate policy should be effectively dealt with on a global basis including developed and developing countries, be based on identification of a technology-based long-term objective, utilize the 'basket of gases' approach, provide credit for early action and protection of industrial baselines, and rely on flexible market mechanisms."¹⁵⁵
3. "The ICCP Mission Statement: The International Climate Change Partnership (ICCP) is a global coalition of companies and trade associations from diverse industries committed to constructive and responsible participation in the international policy process concerning global climate change. The ICCP recognizes that the continued growth in emissions of greenhouse gases is an important concern for all nations and that efforts are underway internationally and in national governments to develop policies that address this concern. ICCP Core Beliefs: Climate change is an important global environmental issue whose resolution requires participation of all nations, developed and developing. International efforts must be guided by credible scientific information and supported by a credible technology and economic assessment process. Climate change issues are most effectively addressed at the global level. Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) must balance environmental concerns associated with greenhouse gas emissions with the need to promote the continued economic growth necessary for the benefit of all nations. Climate change policies should be comprehensive and market-based, and should not single out or disadvantage specific industries."¹⁵⁶

Informed Citizens for the Environment (ifcte)

Active: 1990-1992. Member years: 1990; 1991; 1992.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. "Strategies 1. Reposition global warming as theory (not fact). 2. Target print and radio media for maximum effectiveness. 3: Achieve broad participation across the entire electric utility industry. 4. Start small, start well, and build on early successes. 5. .Get the test concepts developed and implemented as soon as possible. 6. 'Test market' execution in early 1991. 7. Build national involvement as soon as 'test market'

¹⁵⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20110723154130/http://www.iccp.net/docs/uscap.pdf> 1/22/2007. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁵⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20140603211442/http://www.iccp.net/> 6/3/2014. Position: Strongly favor.

results are in hand - summer 1991. 8. Go national in the late fall of 1991 with a media program. 9. Use a spokesman from the scientific community.”¹⁵⁷

2. “The most serious problem with climate change is that it may not be true.”¹⁵⁸

3. “We believe it is wrong to predict that higher levels of carbon dioxide will bring a catastrophic global warming”¹⁵⁹

Interwest Energy Alliance (iea)

Active: 2008-2018. Member years: 2008; 2011; 2014; 2018.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Renewable energy.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Investments in wind, solar and other renewable energy technologies help generate tremendous new economic development opportunities in rural and agricultural areas of the country, enabling farmers, ranchers and landowners to grow reliable new ‘cash crops’ that doesn’t need water.”¹⁶⁰

2. “Interwest is a leading regional driver for the responsible expansion of renewable energy in Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming.”¹⁶¹

3. “‘With solar power and other renewable energy available at historically low prices and battery storage making solar energy available 24/7, we are encouraged that NV Energy is proposing to bring more renewable power online,’ said Sarah Cottrell Propst, executive director of the Interwest Energy Alliance...”¹⁶²

Midwest Ozone Group (mog)

¹⁵⁷https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/1991-Informed-Citizens-for-the-Environment_0.pdf 5/6/1991. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁵⁸https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/1991-Informed-Citizens-for-the-Environment_0.pdf 5/6/1991. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁵⁹https://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/1991-Informed-Citizens-for-the-Environment_0.pdf 5/6/1991. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁶⁰<https://web.archive.org/web/20090311234348/http://www.interwest.org/> 3/11/2009. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁶¹<http://interwest.org/about/> 10/29/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁶²<http://interwest.org/business-community-applauds-nv-energy-proposal-for-six-new-solar-plants/> 6/1/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

Active: 1998-Present. Member years: 1999; 2002; 2005; 2008; 2013; 2015; 2018.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Climate and air pollution.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. "MOG members and participants operate more than 85,000 MW of coal-fired and coal-refuse fired generation in more than ten states. They are concerned about the development of technically unsubstantiated interstate air pollution rules and the impacts on their facilities, their employees, their contractors, and the consumers of their electric power."¹⁶³
2. "MOG responded publicly to the EPA's call for comments on the Clean Power Plan (1994) in the following way: 'MOG shares the concerns... that the proposed rule suffers from a complete lack of legal authority and commits the nation to a radical reform of its energy policies in a manner never contemplated by Congress. These comments will highlight some of the more significant legal defects and provide data to illustrate that the agency's conclusion about the health benefits of this rule are unfounded.'"¹⁶⁴
3. "As is stated in detail... the Midwest Ozone Group supports the Missouri Plan as a conservative justification for the conclusion that no additional emissions reductions beyond existing and planned controls are necessary to mitigate any contribution Missouri may have to any downwind monitors to comply..."¹⁶⁵

Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (mweea)

Active: 2001-Present. Member years: 2004; 2007; 2011; 2014; 2017; 2019.

Total: 348.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "ACE significantly changes the finalized CPP which was expected to increase investments in clean energy

¹⁶³http://midwestozongroup.com/files/Midwest_Ozone_Group.PDF 5/15/2017. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁶⁴https://web.archive.org/web/20170323094307/http://midwestozongroup.com/files/FinalMOGCommentsonProposed111_drule.PDF 11/26/2014. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁶⁵http://midwestozongroup.com/files/Missouri_GNS_Comments_Final_4.3.19.pdf 4/3/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

across the nation. The proposed ACE tradeoffs noted above undermines the opportunities for energy efficiency. Energy efficiency is the lowest cost resource, is a recognized job generator and can serve as a positive compliance tool for states to reduce emissions while improving the community's health and economy. We strongly urge the EPA to maintain the CEIP program in the revised ACE rule and value end-use efficiency upgrades."¹⁶⁶

2. "With the conclusion of the 132nd General Assembly Session on December 31, 2018, a bill to significantly curtail Ohio's energy efficiency resource standard (EERS) officially died, leaving the state's clean energy economy preserved. This was a victory for Ohio's many clean energy jobs, its economy, customers' energy bills and the environment."¹⁶⁷
3. "In 2012, the EPA revised its rules on new source performance standards (NSPS) of greenhouse gas emissions, resulting in stricter regulations on future power plants. Unfortunately, these rules do not address existing power plants, which tend to be heavy greenhouse gas producers. ASBC believes that protecting the environment has always been and should remain a bipartisan effort. The nation needs to invest in clean energy technologies that will create jobs, lead to economies of scale, and lead to cleaner air."¹⁶⁸

North American Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance (nacsaa)

Active: 2018-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate adaptation.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "Staffers were also called on to urge their committee members to embrace biofuels as a climate change solutions pathway."¹⁶⁹
2. "He [NACSAA chairman] cited the three pillars of CSA, including sustainable production; adaptation of operations to changing climate conditions, including building the resilience of soil to withstand dryer,

¹⁶⁶<http://www.mwalliance.org/sites/default/files/meea-research/meea-ace-comments-10.31.18.pdf?current=/taxonomy/term/1110/30/2018>. Position: Weakly favor.

¹⁶⁷<http://www.mwalliance.org/blog/victory-ohio-energy-efficiency-rollback-bill-stalls-without-action> 2/12/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁶⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20110318114935/http://www.mwalliance.org/policy/overview> 3/18/2011. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁶⁹<http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?m=1112300481294&ca=2f30afd5-6fce-49e6-b352-cf84e773e1e9> 6/1/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

wetter conditions; and mitigation of climate change through land management practices (e.g., cover crops) and products (e.g., ethanol, biodiesel) that reduce or avoid emissions.”¹⁷⁰

3. “NACSAA encourages climate smart agriculture (CSA) strategies to enhance the adaptive capacity of North American agriculture to changing climate conditions and works to achieve this goal through three complementary strategies: 1) sustainably increasing agricultural productivity and livelihoods (i.e. sustainable intensification); 2) enhancing adaptive capacity and improving resilience; and 3) delivering ecosystem services, sequestering carbon, and reducing and/or avoiding greenhouse gas emissions.”¹⁷¹

Northwest Energy Coalition (nec)

Active: 1997-Present. Member years: 2019; 2016; 2013; 2010; 2007; 2004; 2001.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Climate and clean energy.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The NW Energy Coalition and its members advocate a clean and affordable energy future for the region based on: Meeting all new energy demand with energy efficiency and new renewable resources. Full and fair accounting for the environmental effects of energy decisions.”¹⁷²
2. “Human-induced global warming poses perhaps the greatest threat ever to our very survival and that of countless other plant and animal species across the globe. To achieve the cuts in emissions in carbon dioxide and other global-warming pollutants needed to avoid the most dire consequences of climate change, we must stop relying on carbon-emitting fossil-fueled power plants for our electricity.”¹⁷³
3. “The obvious conclusion to be drawn from President Bush’s latest global warming strategy, unveiled this week, is that he does not regard warming as a problem. There seems no other way to interpret a policy that would actually increase the gases responsible for heating the earth’s atmosphere. That the policy demands little from the American people, while insulting allies who have agreed to take tough steps to deal with

¹⁷⁰<http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?m=1112300481294&ca=f408bdd0-00cd-44ac-a951-4ca9ec8b629b> 1/1/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁷¹https://www.nacsaa.net/about_us 10/29/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁷²<https://nwenergy.org/about-the-coalition/> 10/29/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

¹⁷³<https://web.archive.org/web/20120215010138/http://www.nwenergy.org/category/issues/climatechange/> 2/15/2012. Position: Strongly favor.

the problem, only adds to one's sense of dismay.”¹⁷⁴

Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (neea)

Active: 2010-2019. Member years: 2010; 2017; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “NEEA has introduced a proposal in the 2018 Washington State Commercial Energy Code to increase the energy efficiency of HVAC systems. The code update would require building designers to evaluate HVAC systems on whole-system performance rather than on individual HVAC components, which would significantly increase energy savings for buildings.”¹⁷⁵
2. “The alliance’s current five-year, \$18.3 million plan is to accelerate the development and market adoption of energy-efficient natural gas products, practices and services and to increase efficiency of natural gas use in the Northwest.”¹⁷⁶
3. “Our telephone hotline serves Northwest energy professionals with tailored, reliable, and unbiased information on products, programs, and technologies. Our EnergyIdeas.org website was launched in 1998 to expand our reach and put useful information into the hands of everyone who can significantly reduce energy use.”¹⁷⁷

Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (neep)

Active: 1996-Present. Member years: 2002; 2004; 2010; 2016; 2019.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

¹⁷⁴<https://web.archive.org/web/20020528071544/http://www.climateresponse.org/2/16/2002>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁷⁵<https://neea.org/news/new-wa-energy-code-would-deliver-significant-energy-savings-for-hvac-systems> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

¹⁷⁶<https://neea.org/our-work/natural-gas> 10/29/2019. Position: Weakly oppose.

¹⁷⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20060615182228/http://www.energyideas.org/about/default.cfm?o=h,a&c=z,z> 6/15/2006. Position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “Appliance Efficiency Standards present one of the most effective ways to accelerate energy efficiency. Appliance standards bring energy and cost savings to consumers, relief to our strained energy system and significant reductions of harmful emissions to our planet.”¹⁷⁸
2. “NEEP works to increase system reliability and reduce both energy expenditures and harmful pollution. We do this by recommending government policies that promote efficient energy consumption.”¹⁷⁹
3. “Goal: Assist the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic region to reduce building sector energy consumption three percent per year and carbon emission 40 percent by 2030 (relative to 2001).”¹⁸⁰

NextGen Energy Council (ngec)

Active: 2006-8. Member years: 2008.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and fossil fuels.

Climate position: Weakly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “With the growth of the nation’s electricity grid failing to keep up with rising demand, blackouts and brownouts will become increasingly widespread and destructive, warns a study released by NextGen Energy Council, a clean coal advocacy group.”¹⁸¹
2. “What will the future bring for America in terms of next-generation energy technologies? High-tech power plants that convert America’s huge coal reserves into ultra-clean energy with virtually zero emissions. High-efficiency facilities that convert coal to super clean liquid fuels, allowing America to begin reducing our dangerous reliance on foreign energy. Hybrid energy facilities that combine the best advantages of both fossil and renewable resources and allow for the deployment of ‘mega-renewable’ deployment. Alternative energy farms that produce ultra-clean energy along with a dizzying array of useful products, materials and fuels. Strategies that allow society to make beneficial use of carbon dioxide as a commodity prior to its final

¹⁷⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20120102125153/http://neep.org/public-policy/2/78/Appliance-Efficiency-Standards> 1/2/2012. Position: Weakly favor.

¹⁷⁹https://web.archive.org/web/20011231014623/http://www.neep.org/html/about/about_background.html 12/31/2001. Position: Neutral.

¹⁸⁰<https://neep.org/about> 10/29/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

¹⁸¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20081222223414/http://www.nextgenenergy.org/nextgen+in+the+news.aspx> 12/22/2008. Position: Strongly oppose.

disposition... To help promote the accelerated deployment of these and other 21st Century technologies, the NextGen Energy Council (NextGen) was formed in 2007. It is a non-profit collaborative of Western and Great Plains Governors, State and federal legislators, State and federal agency officials, business leaders, conservation groups and others committed to accelerating the development of next-generation advanced coal technologies, fossil-renewable hybrid systems and strategies for increasing the economic utilization of carbon dioxide.”¹⁸²

3. “What Is NextGen’s Mission Statement? The NextGen Energy Council (NEC) supports continuing efforts to improve the efficiency and environmental performance of all advanced energy technologies, with these ultimate goals: Educating fellow citizens of the need for balanced energy policies, that take into account environmental, economic and energy factors; Maintaining and expanding consumer access to reliable, affordable and diverse energy resources; Supporting the development and deployment of advanced coal technologies toward an ultimate goal [sic] of near-zero emissions at a competitive cost of electricity; Promoting the use of America’s supply of domestically-produced energy and reducing our reliance on foreign energy; Encouraging partnerships and investment incentives to advance technology development and deployment; and Furthering advanced energy technologies to provide for increased economic growth, family incomes and job creation across the United States.”¹⁸³

New Jersey Energy Coalition (njec)

Active: 2007-Present. Member years: 2007 (as NJ Affordable Clean Reliable Energy Coalition); 2008; 2010; 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Energy prices and nuclear energy.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “We aim to achieve the common goal of assuring a reliable supply of affordable, clean energy in New Jersey.”¹⁸⁴
2. “The Coalition works to educate the public about the need for energy policies that protect the environ-

¹⁸²<https://web.archive.org/web/20081222212546/http://www.nextgenenergy.org/about+us.aspx> 12/22/2008. Position: Weakly oppose.

¹⁸³<https://web.archive.org/web/20081222212557/http://www.nextgenenergy.org/faq.aspx> 12/22/2008. Position: Weakly oppose.

¹⁸⁴https://twitter.com/energy_nj 3/10/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

ment, protect the ratepayer, and improve the state's economy. Our focus includes advocacy for the license renewal of New Jersey's nuclear power plants, the construction of more clean and affordable sources of baseload electricity, the upgrade and expansion of our transmission and distribution infrastructure, and the creation on an energy industry in New Jersey that generates jobs and economic development. The first programmatic goal of the Coalition was to generate public support for renewal of the operating license of the Oyster Creek Generating Station..."¹⁸⁵

3. "The NJ Energy Coalition provides advocacy for initiatives in our state that will provide new development and new jobs in the energy-related fields, including renewable energy projects, energy efficiency programs, construction of new generation facilities and infrastructure investment."¹⁸⁶

New Jersey Sustainable Business Council (njsbc)

Active: 2018-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "Join NJSBC at a rally and festival on Saturday, September 8th, in Morristown... It's an opportunity to demand that our local leaders fight the climate crisis by committing to a fast, fair, and just transition to a renewable energy future that reduces carbon emissions, creates cleaner air, generates good green jobs, and promotes healthier communities."¹⁸⁷
2. "'Today's announcement marks an important milestone and a big step forward in decarbonizing New Jersey's economy,' said Richard Lawton, Executive Director, New Jersey Sustainable Business Council. 'As companies that are committed to sustainable business practices, we know that market-driven innovation and investment must be informed and guided by smart policies aimed at transitioning to a clean energy economy while creating good paying jobs. We applaud Governor Murphy's leadership in rejoining RGGI, and look forward to participating in making the program as strong and effective as possible.'"¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵<http://www.njenergycoalition.org/about/3/10/2019>. Position: Neutral.

¹⁸⁶<http://www.njenergycoalition.org/about/12/18/2019>. Position: Neutral.

¹⁸⁷<https://njsbcouncil.org/2018/09/05/rise-for-climate-jobs-and-justice-rally-and-festival/9/5/2018>. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁸⁸<https://njsbcouncil.org/2018/12/17/murphy-administration-proposes-rules-for-states-re-entry-into-regional-greenhouse-gas-initiative/https://njsbcouncil.org/2018/12/17/murphy->

3. “Last year, Governor Murphy took a major step toward his goal of transitioning New Jersey to 100% clean energy by 2050. The executive order that he signed will pave the way for the development of offshore wind generation along the state’s coast by 2030. NJSBC supports the Governor’s clean energy plan, and applauds the swift actions that he has already taken that will help to create thousands of family supporting green jobs and a cleaner, healthier, and more sustainable economy.”¹⁸⁹

Oil and Gas Climate Initiative (ogci)

Active: 2014-Present. Member years: 2015; 2016; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “OGCI companies set a target to reduce the collective average methane intensity of our aggregated upstream gas and oil operations to below 0.25% by 2025, with the ambition to achieve 0.20%... Our target for our own upstream production facilities is important, but our aim is to work towards near zero methane emissions from the full gas value chain, including transport and distribution to final customers (downstream), which in most cases we do not own or control. We are currently working to estimate and improve the methane emissions intensity of the key gas value chains associated with OGCI member company production. In addition, OGCI members companies support the aims of Zero Routine Flaring by 2030.”¹⁹⁰
2. “Our shared ambition is for a 2°C future. It is a challenge for the whole of society. We are committed to playing our part. Over the coming years we will collectively strengthen our actions and investments to contribute to reducing the GHG intensity of the global energy mix. Our companies will collaborate in a number of areas, with the aim of going beyond the sum of our individual efforts.”¹⁹¹
3. “OGCI member companies are dedicated to the ambition of the Paris Agreement to progress to net zero

administration-proposes-rules-for-states-re-entry-into-regional-greenhouse-gas-initiative/ 12/17/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁸⁸<https://njsbcouncil.org/2019/03/26/join-njsbc-at-the-offshore-wind-partnering-forum/> 3/26/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁹⁰<https://oilandgasclimateinitiative.com/policy-and-strategy> 05/06/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁹¹<https://oilandgasclimateinitiative.com/oil-gas-ceos-jointly-declare-action-climate-change/> 10/16/2015. Position: Strongly favor.

emissions in the second half of this century.”¹⁹²

Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy (pace)

Active: 2011-Present. Member years: 2011; 2013; 2015; 2017.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and fossil fuels.

Climate position: Weakly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “This regulatory agenda will dictate which fuels can power our economy, harms our energy security and will increase energy costs for nearly every business and household in your state. A fundamental problem with this agenda is that EPA that is pursuing regulations and requirements that cannot be achieved by available technologies.”¹⁹³
2. “In response to these trends, PACE has expanded our own examination of divestment. It is critical for regulators, lawmakers and consumers to understand that the spread of energy divestment isn’t a smarter way forward for pensioners, investors or even for clean energy proponents. On the contrary, divestment threatens pension beneficiaries, investors and may even deter leading energy companies from pursuing sustainable energy projects.”¹⁹⁴
3. “It’s time to put the idea of carbon pricing on the shelf for good. Instead, policymakers should work alongside energy experts and researchers to plot a more realistic course that unleashes our ingenuity rather than hamstringing our economy. We have all the resources we need to move together into a cleaner future that keeps the lights on.”¹⁹⁵

Partnership for a Better Energy Future (pbef)

Active: 2011-Present. Member years: 2014; 2015; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

¹⁹²<https://oilandgasclimateinitiative.com/our-members/> 05/06/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁹³<http://energyfairness.org/about-energy-fairness/> 05/06/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁹⁴<http://energyfairness.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/dangers-of-divestment.pdf> 12/12/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

¹⁹⁵<http://energyfairness.org/carbon-pricing-wrong-approach-to-combating-climate-change/> 08/22/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “Right now the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing new greenhouse gas (GHG) regulations that threaten to dramatically increase energy costs in the United States. This means what begins with new GHG regulations for power plants will eventually reach nearly all segments of your states economy.”¹⁹⁶
2. “The Partnership’s fundamental mission is to promote an ‘all-of-the-above’ energy strategy that ensures the continued availability of reliable and affordable energy for American families and businesses. The Partnership totals 177 members, which include national organizations as well as state and local associations in 36 different states. All are united by widespread concerns that carbon regulations on power plants—as well as EPA’s broader GHG regulatory agenda—present a significant threat to American jobs and the economy.”¹⁹⁷
3. “The Partnership for a Better Energy Future is a coalition of stakeholders representing nearly every segment of the U.S. economy, unified in our support for responsible energy regulations. The Partnership aims to educate and mobilize the broader business community and elected and public officials to address widespread concerns with forthcoming greenhouse gas rules. Its membership includes national groups representing businesses and consumers from all industries of the U.S. economy. This collection of diverse perspectives is united under a common interest in ensuring the Administration’s greenhouse gas (GHG) regulatory actions do not harm American jobs and the economy.”¹⁹⁸

Pennsylvania Coal Alliance (pennca)

Active: 2013-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and coal.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “This rule is as much a state energy policy as it is an environmental regulation and a clear overreach by

¹⁹⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20140523104425/http://www.betterenergyfuture.org/contact-your-governor/> 05/23/2014. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁹⁷http://documents.nam.org/ERP/PBEF_ARENA_Support_Letter_Final.pdf 08/04/2015. Position: Strongly oppose.

¹⁹⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20140516054942/http://www.betterenergyfuture.org/about> 05/16/2014. Position: Strongly oppose.

the Environmental Protection Agency to achieve the Administration’s goal of cutting coal from America’s electric portfolio. EPA’s ‘Clean Power Plan’ represents the biggest obstacle to continued coal use that has confronted the industry in decades. Although it is billed by proponents as a flexible and achievable way for states to curb GHG emissions, it is a de facto attempt to transform America’s energy usage away from coal.”¹⁹⁹

2. “COAL TRUTH : Modern coal power is the best solution for millions of Americans and billions of people around the world. It is reliable, affordable, resilient and safe. ”²⁰⁰
3. “The Pennsylvania Coal Alliance (PCA), along with 47 lawmakers, business owners, electric ratepayers and laborers statewide took to paper and email to submit comments of opposition to EPA on the proposed Clean Power Plan (CPP). ‘We see the Clean Power Plan as dramatic overstepping of EPA’s legal authority under the Clean Air Act. It will have dire consequences on state, regional and national economies if enacted. This is not just environmental regulation, it is a forced state energy policy,’ said PCA CEO, John Pippy. The coal industry and its utility customers have been actively developing advancements in generation efficiencies and pollution reductions, particularly with the development of state-of-the-art clean coal technologies in recent years. ”²⁰¹

Sustainable Business Network of Massachusetts (sbnma)

Active: 1988-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “...the challenge of Global Climate Change is entirely unlike any other challenge humans have faced in the past. It is Global like no other problem has ever been, it is collective like no other problem has ever been, and it is complicated and messy.”²⁰²

¹⁹⁹<https://www.betterwithcoal.com/epa-111d05/06/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁰⁰<https://www.betterwithcoal.com/05/06/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁰¹https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/203afb_19745d3fe4ce43f096bc42cc57c7396f.pdf
12/01/2014. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁰²<http://sbnmass.org/2016/09/if-two-and-two-and-fifty-make-a-million-how-to-develop-an-effective-call-to-action-to-fight-climate-change/> 09/23/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

2. “By building a movement of small and mid-sized businesses and allies who share our mission to grow an economy that is local, green, and fair, we’re creating a vibrant, caring community and a sustainable future. We do this by.. Championing initiatives and business practices that mitigate climate change... Advocating for public policy and legislation that positively impacts the growth of a strong, sustainable economy.”²⁰³

Sustainable Energy Coalition (sec)

Active: 2002-2019. Member years: 2002; 2005; 2016; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Sustainable Energy Coalition acts as a facilitator to focus the message of advocacy, technical, and industry organizations to move forward in a coordinated fashion to accelerate the development and implementation of sustainable, renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.”²⁰⁴
2. “Coalition members advocate federal energy policies that will lead to a cleaner environment, safe reliable energy technologies, and a secure, prosperous future for all Americans. Avenues for Coalition activity include policy decisions on the federal budget, electric utility restructuring, pollution prevention, climate change, and tax policies.”²⁰⁵
3. “The SEC Web site is designed to highlight its members and educate key decision makers in government, the media and the financial community – the benefits and opportunities in significantly utilizing energy efficiency and renewable energy to grow the global economy, stabilize energy prices and international tensions, lower GREENHOUSE GAS and regulated emissions, and reduce instability from conventional energy resources, technologies and infrastructure.”²⁰⁶

Second Nature (secnat)

Active: 1993-Present. Member years: 2000; 2003; 2006; 2009; 2012; 2015; 2017; 2019.

²⁰³<http://sbnmass.org/about-us/mission-and-vision> 03/09/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁰⁴<http://sustainableenergy.org/10/29/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁰⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20050306014935/http://www.sustainableenergy.org/coalition/about.asp> 03/06/2005. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁰⁶<https://web.archive.org/web/20100314211931/http://www.sustainableenergycoalition.org/> 03/14/2010. Position: Weakly favor.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate and sustainability.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "It is in the interest of the signatories of the Second Nature Presidents' Climate Leadership Commitments to ensure that investments in carbon offsets result in real GHG reductions and that carbon offset projects add value to their education, research, and service missions while helping to create a healthy, just, and sustainable society."²⁰⁷
2. "Higher Education has a unique role in society. Reversing global warming is the defining challenge of the 21st century. This is a challenge of massive proportions, one that desperately calls for vision and leadership of higher education. By committing to rapidly eliminate their own contributions to global warming and swiftly accelerate education and research, institutions will be leading the crucial race to find global warming solutions."²⁰⁸
3. "Mission: Second Nature is committed to accelerating climate action in, and through, higher education... Since its founding in 1993, Second Nature has played a critical role in mobilizing higher education to move the needle towards the goal of a sustainable society. We created and oversee the largest voluntary carbon neutrality commitment in any sector in the United States. Millions of students have passed through these schools, and this history has placed Second Nature in a key leadership position working with higher education to advance sustainability."²⁰⁹

Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (seea)

Active: 2007-Present. Member years: 2009; 2012; 2016; 2019.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. "Energy efficiency improvements offer many benefits that also make buildings, energy systems, and com-

²⁰⁷<https://secondnature.org/wp-content/uploads/Carbon-Markets-and-Offsets-Guidance-1.pdf> 11/09/2017. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁰⁸<https://secondnature.org/publications/page/6/> 03/01/2007. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁰⁹<https://secondnature.org/mission/> 05/09/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

munities more resilient to natural disasters. For example, structurally-insulated walls and multi-pane windows both reduce a home's energy consumption and improve its resistance to damage from high winds or flying debris. Energy efficiency technologies like combined heat and power allow buildings to operate during power outages..."²¹⁰

2. "Energy efficiency measures make it possible for us to create products, services and benefits for the lowest energy cost. In addition, because energy efficiency reduces the amount of energy that gets wasted, it offers many important benefits, including: The opportunity to defer or eliminate the need to build new electric power generating and transmitting facilities and capacity, which keeps electric rates lower..."²¹¹
3. "The American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) examined the link between economic development and energy efficiency in Illinois (report E982, 1998). The benefits they found included energy bill savings, job creation, wage increases, and the reduction of air pollutants."²¹²

South Central Partnership for Energy Efficiency (speer)

Active: 2011-Present. Member years: 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. "The South-central Partnership for Energy Efficiency as a Resource (SPEER), is a regional energy efficiency organization (REEO) that aims to accelerate the adoption of advanced building systems and energy efficient products and services in our region, Texas and Oklahoma."²¹³
2. "Energy efficiency delivers proven economic and environmental benefits. Efficiency resources help increase electric reliability and lower overall energy costs. Numerous studies have shown the abundant potential for utilizing energy efficiency as a least-cost resource."²¹⁴

²¹⁰<https://www.seealliance.org/initiatives/energy-efficiency-policy/resilience/> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

²¹¹<https://www.seealliance.org/about/what-is-energy-efficiency/> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

²¹²<https://web.archive.org/web/20090119094723/http://www.seealliance.org/why-e-e-se.html> 01/19/2009. Position: Neutral.

²¹³<https://eepartnership.org/about/> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

²¹⁴<https://eepartnership.org/program-areas/policy/> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

3. "SPEER joined with four other US regional energy organizations (REEOs) who work across 42 states to recommend the US EPA count increased energy efficiency toward forthcoming carbon emission standards, a draft of which is due by June 1, 2014. The policy whitepaper, authored by Howard Geller of the Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, asked EPA to adopt a policy that would allow states the flexibility to make full use of energy efficiency and renewable energy to cost effectively comply with the standard."²¹⁵

Sustainable Silicon Valley (ssv)

Active: 2000-Present. Member years: 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Sustainability and climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "We must keep driving down carbon pollution to avoid the worst effects of climate change, which is already taking a toll... A YES vote on SB 32 shows the world that the California legislature will continue to lead the fight for clean air, thriving communities, and a healthy planet."²¹⁶
2. "For many years now, Sustainable Silicon Valley has been advocating for a Net Positive Bay Area, an action-based initiative that seeks to build a regenerative region by 2050: generate more renewable energy than we use, sequester more carbon than we emit, and optimize water resources to ensure water resilience. On December 12, 2015 in Paris, COP21 agreed to limit global warming to well below 2 degree Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degree Celsius above pre-industrial levels through 2100. This means that we may involve something called negative emissions, a component of Sustainable Silicon Valley's Net Positive Bay Area goals where we take out more carbon dioxide from the air than we put in."²¹⁷
3. "Vision: SSV envisions a Net Positive Bay Area by 2050 where we produce more renewable energy than we consume, sequester more carbon than we emit, and optimize water resources to ensure water resilience."²¹⁸

²¹⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20141011004838/http://eepartnership.org/airquality/10/11/2014>. Position: Weakly favor.

²¹⁶<http://www.wp.sustainablesv.org/ssv-supports-sb-32/08/01/2016>. Position: Strongly favor.

²¹⁷<http://www.wp.sustainablesv.org/net-negative-emissions-cop21-ssvs-net-positive-carbon-sequestration/12/01/2015>. Position: Strongly favor.

²¹⁸<http://www.wp.sustainablesv.org/05/22/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (sweep)

Active: 2001-Present. Member years: 2010; 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “The Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (SWEET) is a public-interest organization promoting greater energy efficiency and clean transportation in Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming”²¹⁹
2. “Compared to gasoline fueled vehicles, electric vehicles (EVs) use much less energy, can be powered by locally produced renewable electricity (as opposed to imported oil), can significantly improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and dramatically reduce fuel costs. For these and other reasons, SWEET works to promote the increased adoption of EVs across the Southwest.”²²⁰
3. “Legislative efforts are a primary tool used by SWEET to advocate for energy efficiency across the Southwest. We work closely with a wide-ranging group of stakeholders – consumer and environmental organizations, state agencies, businesses, utilities, elected officials – to draft and support legislation that eliminates barriers to and stimulates the development of energy efficiency programs and policies. Through such collaborative efforts, significant progress has been made in expanding the access that business and residential electricity and natural gas customers have to energy efficiency programs.”²²¹

The Climate Group (tcg)

Active: 2004-Present. Member years: 2006; 2009; 2011; 2014; 2016; 2018.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Our goal is a prosperous, low carbon future. We believe this will be achieved through a ‘clean revolution’: the rapid scale-up of low carbon energy and technology. We work with corporate and government

²¹⁹<http://www.swenergy.org/about> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

²²⁰<http://www.swenergy.org/transportation/electric-vehicles> 10/29/2019. Position: Weakly favor.

²²¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20051225165305/http://www.swenergy.org/policies/index.html> 12/25/2005. Position: Neutral.

partners to develop climate finance mechanisms, business models which promote innovation, and supportive policy frameworks. We convene leaders, share hard evidence of successful low carbon growth, and pilot practical solutions which can be replicated worldwide.”²²²

2. “OUR BELIEFS: 1. The atmosphere is fundamentally important as a global commons for all and that the climate plays a critical role in shaping human society, the global economy, and the natural world. 2. Present and future generations have the right to a climate that does not diminish socioeconomic opportunities or negatively impact the functioning of natural systems as a result of human activity. 3. Climate change is an urgent problem that requires collaborative international efforts to substantially reduce global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and transition to a low carbon economy. 4. The transition to a low carbon economy within a timeframe that minimizes the risk of serious impacts is compatible with, and essential for, promoting economic growth and increasing human prosperity. 5. A broad market transformation is needed in the way we produce and consume energy, with a rapid shift to low and no carbon energy sources and substantially increased efficiency and energy savings. Transforming the market and reducing GHG emissions must be pursued in a manner that equitably reconciles development goals and climate protection. 6. Individuals, companies and all levels of governments share the responsibility to minimize GHG emissions by implementing or providing solutions and measures, many of which already exist.”²²³
3. “‘Renewable energy is common sense energy,’ Steve Howard, Chief Sustainability Officer, IKEA Group said in an interview for Climate TV. ‘RE100 is a fantastic initiative, because it’s setting ambitious, broad time frames, and stimulating the market for ambitious deployment of renewables.’”²²⁴

Utility Air Regulatory Group (uarg)

Active: 1977-Present. Member years: 2006.²²⁵

Scope: National.

²²²<https://web.archive.org/web/20141008202845/http://www.theclimategroup.org/who-we-are/about-us/> 10/08/2014. Position: Strongly favor.

²²³<https://web.archive.org/web/20141008162735/http://www.theclimategroup.org/who-we-are/our-members/our-member-principles/> 10/08/2014. Position: Strongly favor.

²²⁴<https://www.theclimategroup.org/news/last-coal-fired-plants-shut-down-south-australia-and-scotland-show-global-rise-renewable-energy> 05/10/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

²²⁵Membership has generally not been made publicly available, but was (apparently inadvertently) included in comments submitted to the EPA “COMMENTS OF THE UTILITY AIR REGULATORY GROUP on NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR PARTICULATE MATTER; PROPOSED RULE 71 Fed. Reg. 2620 (January 17, 2006) (Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2001-0017)”. 4/17/2006.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

Quotes:

1. "The Utility Air Regulatory Group was the main plaintiff in a Supreme court cases (UARG vs Environmental Protection Agency) which sought to challenge the legal basis for the EPA regulating greenhouse gas emissions. The initial complaint was much broader, but the court only permitted the case to proceed on a narrower issue that had not been resolved in Massachusetts vs EPA."
2. "UARG has frequently argued against tighter air pollution and climate regulations; Wehrum is undoing many of the policies at EPA that the group targeted when he represented it at Hunton."²²⁶
3. "The Utility Air Regulatory Group (UARG) is a little known but influential group that has fought EPA Clean Air Act rules. The group has described itself as 'a not-for-profit association of individual generating companies and national trade associations that participates on behalf of its members collectively...'"²²⁷

University Climate Change Coalition (uccc)

Active: 2018-Present. Member years: 2019.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "The recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report on 1.5 degrees of warming (SR15) warned of severe consequences of a failure to prevent global warming exceeding 1.5°C. To limit temperature increase to 1.5°C, emissions need to halve by 2030, and drop to net-zero by 2050 for the best chance of avoiding the worst impacts of climate change."²²⁸
2. "The University Climate Change Coalition, or UC3, is a bold new coalition of leading North American research universities that will prototype a collaborative model designed to help local communities achieve their climate goals and accelerate the transition to a low-carbon future. In launching UC3, distinguished

²²⁶<https://www.politico.com/story/2019/05/10/epa-air-chief-3238271> 05/10/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

²²⁷<https://www.energyandpolicy.org/utility-air-regulatory-group/> 11/05/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

²²⁸<https://secondnature.org/about-uc3/research-for-policy/> 11/05/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

universities from the United States, Canada and Mexico have committed to mobilize their resources and expertise to accelerate local and regional climate action in partnership with businesses, cities and states, foundations, and other organizations.”²²⁹

3. “Our 2019-2022 Strategic Plan focuses on the imperative for exponential growth in climate progress to work towards 50% decarbonization in the US economy by 2030 based on advice from the best available science.”²³⁰

Utah Clean Energy (uce)

Active: 2001-Present. Member years: 2007; 2010; 2013; 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Energy efficiency.

Climate position: Weakly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The fastest and most affordable way to transition to a clean energy future is to reduce the amount of energy that is wasted. By increasing the energy efficiency of our homes, buildings, and vehicles, it’s easy to get more for less: more productivity, less wastefulness; more comfort, less compromise; more profit, less pollution.”²³¹
2. “Utah Clean Energy is committed to creating a future where we significantly decrease our carbon-based energy consumption, become more energy efficient, and increase our use of renewable energy. Our programs focus on policy advocacy, regulatory intervention, and educational activities.”²³²
3. “Climate change represents one of the most significant economic and cultural challenges of the 21st century; understanding the complexity of this challenge is critical to addressing it.”²³³

United States Climate Action Partnership (uscap)

Active: 2006-2013. Member years: 2008; 2009; 2013.

²²⁹<https://secondnature.org/initiative/uc3-coalition/> 05/22/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²³⁰<https://secondnature.org/mission/> 11/05/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²³¹<https://utahcleanenergy.org/about-us/what-we-do> 10/29/2019. Position: Neutral.

²³²https://web.archive.org/web/20090225114539/http://utahcleanenergy.org/our_work 02/25/2009. Position: Weakly favor.

²³³<https://utahcleanenergy.org/issues/build-a-smart-energy-future/item/571-utah-leaders-convene-for-climate-briefing> 08/30/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “Recognizing the immense risks that climate change poses to people and the planet, several large companies and national environmental organizations came together as the United States Climate Action Partnership (USCAP) to advocate for climate action at the federal level. Meridian helped the USCAP’s diverse membership reach agreement on strategy and policy recommendations. These consensus recommendations strongly influenced landmark legislation, commonly referred to as the Waxman-Markey bill, passed by the House of Representatives in 2009.”²³⁴
2. “Climate stabilization requires immediate action and sustained effort over several decades. Mandatory requirements and incentives must be stringent enough to achieve necessary emissions reductions within timeframes that prevent an unacceptable level of GHG concentrations and climate change. We must start a program in the near-term that captures short-range reduction opportunities, puts us on the path to stabilizing concentrations, and preserves our options to avoid an unacceptable level of climate change in the future.”²³⁵
3. “The United States faces an urgent need to transform our nation’s economy, make the country more energy secure, and take meaningful action to slow, stop, and reverse GHG emissions to address climate change. The economic, energy, and global warming realities facing the nation are characterized by a detrimental dependence on foreign oil, economic instability, and a growing recognition that the impacts of a warming planet are being felt today.”²³⁶

We Are Still In (wasi)

Active: 2017-Present. Member years: 2017; 2018; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

²³⁴ <https://merid.org/case-study/u-s-climate-action-partnership/> 11/06/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²³⁵ <https://s31207.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/USCAP-A-Call-for-Action.pdf> 07/01/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²³⁶ <https://s31207.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/USCAP-A-Blueprint-for-Legislative-Action.pdf> 01/01/2009. Position: Strongly favor.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "Initiative 1631 would help level the playing field for clean energy by ensuring that those who pollute the most, pay the most. The Evergreen State is already feeling the impacts of climate change through heat waves, sea level rise, ocean acidification, and increased wildfires, including those that made Seattle's air quality worse than Beijing's this summer. Initiative 1631 is especially focused on enhancing the resilience of local communities that are disproportionately affected by climate impacts."²³⁷
2. "Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change detailed the dire global consequences of allowing global temperature increases to exceed 2.7°F / 1.5°C. Similarly, the National Climate Assessment detailed that the impacts of climate change are already impacting every place and walk of life in the United States. Our future is at stake. For these reasons, we endorse H.R. 9: Climate Action Now Act, which advances our commitment to address climate change and support the Paris Agreement..."²³⁸
3. "Mayors, governors, and business leaders first began signing the We Are Still In declaration in June 2017 as a promise to world leaders that Americans would not retreat from the global pact to reduce emissions and stem the causes of climate change."²³⁹

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (wbcsd)

Active: 2003-Present. Member years: 2004; 2006; 2013; 2016.

Scope: International.

Focus: Climate and sustainable development.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "A core component of our Climate Policy activities is to foster strong policy signals and economic incentives promoting a race-to-the-top where sustainable solutions can succeed. We actively call for policies that are consistent with ambitious action on climate and enable business-led solutions to scale and speed implementation of the Paris Agreement."²⁴⁰

²³⁷<https://www.wearestillin.com/news/statement-washington-initiative-1631> 11/01/2018. Position: Strongly favor.

²³⁸<https://www.wearestillin.com/letter-speaker-pelosi-and-leader-mccarthy-support-hr9> 04/29/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²³⁹<https://www.wearestillin.com/about> 05/06/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴⁰<https://www.wbcsd.org/Programs/Climate-and-Energy/Climate/Climate-Action-and->

2. “Sustainable development challenges are huge and require contributions from all parties — governments, business, civil societies and international bodies. Confrontation puts the solutions at risk. Cooperation and creative partnerships foster sustainable development.”²⁴¹
3. “Must haves include: Incorporating the costs of externalities, starting with carbon, ecosystem services and water, into the structure of the marketplace; Doubling agricultural output without increasing the amount of land or water used; Halting deforestation and increasing yields from planted forests; Halving carbon emissions worldwide (based on 2005 levels) by 2050 through a shift to low-carbon energy systems; Improved demand-side energy efficiency, and providing universal access to low-carbon mobility. Vision 2050, with its best-case scenario for sustainability and pathways for reaching it, is a tool for thought leadership and a platform for beginning the dialogue that must take place to navigate the challenging years to come.”²⁴²

Western Business Roundtable (wbr)

Active: 2001-2009. Member years: 2002; 2003; 2004; 2007.

Scope: Regional.

Focus: Energy exploration and infrastructure.

Climate position: Neutral.

Quotes:

1. “At the Western Business Roundtable, we work to enact public policies that encourage economic growth, opportunity and freedom of enterprise. We work for a better balance between economic development and environmental preservation. We are proud defenders of the Western way of life. Specifically, we pursue the following goals: Encourage a more profitable business climate in the West; Reduce government regulation of people and their business and industry; and Provide a forum for the resolution of business and industry problems on a regional basis by those directly concerned and to actively advocate policy solutions at the state, regional and federal levels.”²⁴³

Policy 11/05/2019. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20130517190117/http://www.wbcasd.org/newsroom/key-messages.aspx> 05/17/2013. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴²<https://web.archive.org/web/20160605081301/http://www.wbcasd.org/vision2050.aspx> 06/05/2016. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴³<https://web.archive.org/web/20020808014309/http://www.westernroundtable.com/whatwedo.htm> 08/08/2002. Position: Weakly oppose.

2. "Mission To provide a common voice for the business community in the West, establish a balanced view-point between economic development and environmental preservation, provide a forum for the resolution of business and industry problems on a regional basis."²⁴⁴
3. "Issues Facing the West: The Roundtable engages in a large number of federal legislative and regulatory policy issues impacting Western energy and natural resource sector businesses. Major areas of emphasis include: Air Policy / Clean Air Act / Climate Change. Energy Security. Environmental Compliance. Minerals Security..²⁴⁵

We Can Lead (wcl)

Active: 2008-2010. Member years: 2010.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. "As you set the nation's legislative agenda and policy priorities for the Second Session of the 111th Congress, we, American business leaders from companies of all sizes and sectors of our economy, call on you to move swiftly and boldly to enact comprehensive energy and climate legislation. This legislation will spur a new energy economy and with it create 1.7 million new American jobs, many in struggling communities across the country. At the same time, it will enhance our national security by making America more energy independent while also cutting carbon emissions. Today, the United States is falling behind in the global race to lead the new energy economy. American businesses recognize this challenge and have already begun to respond and innovate. We are developing new technologies, launching new companies, and introducing new business models that drive economic growth, create new jobs and decrease our carbon footprint. However, today's uncertainty surrounding energy and climate regulation is hindering the large-scale actions that American businesses are poised to make."²⁴⁶
2. "The reality is that every day we fail to create a price on carbon, we put our future, our economy and our national security at risk. American business leaders and investors still support Senate action this year on

²⁴⁴<https://www.guidestar.org/profile/87-0357561> 11/05/2019. Position: Neutral.

²⁴⁵<https://web.archive.org/web/20120205053541/http://www.westernroundtable.com/ISSUES.aspx> 02/05/2012. Position: Neutral.

²⁴⁶"Dear President Obama and Members of Congress". We Can Lead. 01/01/2010. Position: Strongly favor.

comprehensive, energy and climate legislation in order to unleash investments in new technologies, create new jobs and move America to a new energy future.”²⁴⁷

3. “We need you to swiftly enact comprehensive legislation to cut carbon pollution and create an economy-wide cap and trade program. We support this legislation because certainty and rules of the road enable us to plan, build, innovate and expand our businesses. Putting a price on carbon will drive investment into cost-saving, energy-saving technologies, and will create the next wave of jobs in the new energy economy”²⁴⁸

Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group (wiscieg)

Active: 1973-Present. Member years: 2007; 2013; 2014; 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Energy prices.

Climate position: Weakly oppose.

Quotes:

1. “WIEG’s primary focus is to advocate for reliable and cost effective gas and electric service for Wisconsin energy consumers... Power is a major cost of doing business, and its affordability can help or hinder job creation. High energy costs directly impact the bottom line of industrial customers because in many cases, these costs cannot be passed to downstream customers due to highly competitive business conditions... Major Public Policy Agenda Items 2019: ...Mitigating the cost of the EPA’s air rules for Wisconsin’s ratepayers... Supporting energy efficiency & renewable programs that get the most ‘bang for the buck’ with cost containment or opt-out language for large customers.”²⁴⁹
2. “The Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group (WIEG) is a progressive, non-profit group advocating for reliable, affordable energy in Wisconsin. WIEG represents Wisconsin businesses that serve as key drivers of economic growth and development throughout the state. Those businesses employ more than 75,000 Wisconsin residents, each of whom is a state taxpayer and utility ratepayer.”²⁵⁰

²⁴⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20160320002619/http://wecanlead.org/> 07/01/2010. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴⁸<https://thinkprogress.org/american-companies-tell-senate-we-can-lead-on-clean-energy-chu-locke-browner-headline-clean-economy-49eca2e50da1/> 10/07/2009. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁴⁹<http://wieg.org/about-us/> 05/09/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁵⁰<https://web.archive.org/web/20051125040250/http://wieg.org/> 11/25/2005. Position: Neutral.

3. “Defeated the Global Warming Bill WIEG member companies are the largest and most energy-intensive consumers and are uniquely impacted by greenhouse gas and air emission reduction policies. WIEG members have facilities in many states and countries. In order to maintain a level playing field, WIEG advocates for global warming/air emissions regulations to be federalized to the greatest extent practicable and meet strong cost-benefit criteria. Our industries need government to be a partner in helping to reduce costs and improve competitiveness, not increase costs and reduce competitiveness. Due in large part to WIEG’s aggressive lobbying and coalition building efforts, the state’s global warming bill officially died at the end of the 2010 legislative session.”²⁵¹

We Mean Business (wmb)

Active: 2014-Present. Member years: 2015; 2016; 2018; 2019.

Scope: National.

Focus: Climate.

Climate position: Strongly favor.

Quotes:

1. “The Trump administration’s proposed rollback of federal methane regulations is ‘another dangerous, ill-advised maneuver that aims to sabotage climate action while flying in the face of investor concerns,’ said Andrew Logan, senior director of oil and gas at Ceres, adding that ‘all eyes are now squarely on the oil and gas companies to see where they stand on methane.’”²⁵²
2. “We Mean Business is a global nonprofit coalition working with the world’s most influential businesses to take action on climate change. Together we catalyze business leadership to drive policy ambition and accelerate the transition to a zero-carbon economy... Our mission is to ensure that the world economy is on track to avoid dangerous climate change by 2020 while delivering sustainable growth and prosperity for all... The zero-carbon transition is underway and forward-looking businesses are harnessing climate action as a driver of innovation, competitiveness, risk management and growth. We are mobilizing businesses to set ambitious targets and equipping them to seize the opportunities of the zero-carbon transition. Hundreds of businesses have helped kick-start this transition by setting science-based emissions reduction targets and

²⁵¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20131207082126/http://wieg.org/legislative.html>
07/12/2013. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁵²<https://www.wemeanbusinesscoalition.org/press-release/dangerous-short-sighted-methane-rollback-proposal-puts-oil-and-gas-companies-on-the-spot-2/> 09/12/2019.
Position: Strongly favor.

taking action to deliver against those targets by committing to transition to 100% renewable power. But it is not happening fast enough. The necessary speed and scale of the transition requires all companies and sectors to engage proactively to reduce emissions at the rate required to avoid dangerous climate change. Which is why our coalition is working together to catalyze further, faster corporate climate action.”²⁵³

3. “Carbon pricing is one of the key policies which businesses around the world are calling for to help harness the power of markets in tackling climate change,’ said Nigel Topping, CEO of We Mean Business. ‘We need to see much broader adoption of carbon pricing around the world and, crucially, we need to make sure that price levels are sufficiently high to drive investment in our low carbon future.’”²⁵⁴

West Virginia Coal Association/Friends of Coal (wvca)

Active: 1915(2002)-Present. Member years: 2006; 2016; 2019.

Scope: State.

Focus: Climate and coal.

Climate position: Strongly oppose.

1. “House Bills 3142 and 3144 are critical to rebuilding West Virginia’s coal industry and protecting our mining jobs. The first bill lowers the coal severance tax on steam coal so we can compete against coal from other states that have no severance tax in what remains in the coal-fired electricity market, The second offers a tax rebate on any new investment in West Virginia that expands coal production and employment. Importantly, neither bill would impact the share of coal severance taxes that is provided to county and local governments. We need both of these bills to secure our future-to make sure our miners keep working and that West Virginia provides that energy that the nation and the world so desperately needs. We need these bills to sustain the industry’s recovery after the devastating War on Coal.”²⁵⁵
2. “Located in Charleston, W.Va., the West Virginia Coal Association is a trade association representing more than 90 percent of the state’s underground and surface coal mine production. Its purpose is to have a unified voice representing the state’s coal industry as well as increase emphasis on coal as a reliable energy

²⁵³<https://www.wemeanbusinesscoalition.org/about/05/07/2019>. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁵⁴<https://www.wemeanbusinesscoalition.org/press-release/cdp-and-we-mean-business-unveil-toolkit-to-unlock-large-scale-decarbonization/09/24/2015>. Position: Strongly favor.

²⁵⁵<https://www.wvcoal.com/latest/support-house-bills-3142-and-3144-02/28/2019>. Position: Strongly oppose.

source to help the nation achieve energy independence. Our Mission: By communicating with one voice, we will work together to create an environment that will establish West Virginia coal as a safer, cleaner and more competitive energy source... To implement an organized, focused effort to inform key demographic segments across West Virginia of the advantages of using West Virginia coal.”²⁵⁶

3. “The Friends of Coal is dedicated to inform and educate West Virginia citizens about the coal industry and its vital role in the state’s future. Our goal is to provide a united voice for an industry that has been and remains a critical economic contributor to West Virginia. By working together, we can provide good jobs and benefits for future generations, which will keep our children and grandchildren close to home.”²⁵⁷

²⁵⁶<https://www.wvcoal.com/who-we-are> 05/09/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

²⁵⁷<https://www.friendsofcoal.org/about-foc/who-we-are.html> 05/09/2019. Position: Strongly oppose.

Groups excluded

In this section we include two lists of groups or coalitions that were not included in our final data for a substantive reason, and groups that were not included because we could not find the membership. In the latter case, it may be that the group had no membership and was only claiming to be a member-based organization or coalition.

Group Name	Substantive Reason for Exclusion
Agriculture Energy Alliance	Focused on reducing gas prices only.
Alabama Clean Fuels Coalition	Focused on domestic energy and alternative fuels.
Alliance for Climate Protection/Climate Reality Project	Primarily an NGO.
Association for Energy Affordability	No producer members.
BlueGreen Alliance	No producer members.
C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group	Governments only.
Coalition for Vehicle Choice	Mostly focused on auto safety standards.
Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow	Primarily an NGO.
Environmentally Conscious Consumers for Oil Shale	Front group focused on shale oil exploitation.
Energy Future Coalition	Individuals drawn from business, NGOs
Global Climate and Health Alliance	No members are producers.
Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition	Focused on non-climate related coal regulation.
Home Star Coalition	Focused on retrofitting houses.
International Carbon Action Partnership	Governments only.
International Climate Science Coalition	Primarily an NGO.
Missourians for a Balanced Energy Future	Focused on energy infrastructure, biomass, and nuclear.
Northwest Energy Efficiency Council	Self-identifies as a trade association.
Partnership for America (partnership for the west)	Focused on exploiting natural resources only.
Southeastern Wind Coalition	Focused on wind energy.
Under2 Coalition	Governments only.
United States Climate Alliance	State governments only.
Wisconsin Sustainable Business Council	Not a membership organization.

Group Name	Groups Unable to be Fully Identified.
American Energy Alliance	Membership unavailable.
Americans for American Energy	Membership unavailable.
Clean Affordable Reliable Electricity Coalition	Membership unavailable.
Coalition for Clean & Renewable Energy	No online trace.
Coalition Opposed to Energy Taxes	Membership unavailable.
Energy Research Coalition	No online trace.
Generators for Clean Air Coalition	Membership unavailable.
Information Council on the Environment	Membership unavailable.
Institute for Energy Research	Membership unavailable.
International Climate Science Coalition	Not clearly a membership organization.
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	Not clearly a membership organization.
Sustainable Business Alliance	Membership unavailable.
Sustainable Business Council of Greater Philadelphia	Membership unavailable.
Sustainable Business Council of LA	Membership unavailable.

Lobbying key words and bills

To search for firms and associations (and other groups) that have lobbied on climate issues, we took two approaches. First, we used key words in the specific issue field. These are “climate”, “Paris agreement”, “global warming”, “Kyoto”, “greenhouse gas”, “clean power plan”, “carbon emission”, and “clean energy”. We also examined lobbying on three specific climate bill clusters: the American Clean Energy and Security Act; a cluster of contemporaneous alternatives from the Senate; and the Climate Stewardship Acts of 2003-8. We consider any firm, association or other actor that lobbied on one of these approaches as having lobbied on climate policy.

Appendix B: Additional Models

4-digit Industry Fixed Effects

The models contained below replicate Tables 2 and 5 from the main text but with the inclusion of 4-digit industry fixed effects.

Table B1

	Oppose			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.01 (0.01)			0.02 (0.01)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.50*** (0.04)			0.41*** (0.04)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		-0.01 (0.02)		-0.02 (0.02)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.51*** (0.07)		0.33*** (0.07)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.48*** (0.06)	0.34*** (0.06)
Large	0.47*** (0.03)	0.50*** (0.05)	0.36*** (0.03)	0.82*** (0.06)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Multinational	2.21*** (0.08)	2.21*** (0.08)	2.20*** (0.08)	2.21*** (0.08)
Delisted	0.65*** (0.07)	0.67*** (0.07)	0.64*** (0.07)	0.66*** (0.07)
Listed	1.25*** (0.07)	1.31*** (0.07)	1.25*** (0.07)	1.25*** (0.07)
Sub. of US parent	0.21*** (0.02)	0.21*** (0.02)	0.21*** (0.02)	0.21*** (0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)
Intercept	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.02)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 397818. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 4-digit NAICS level.

Table B2

	Lobbied			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.03*			0.03**
	(0.01)			(0.01)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.56***			0.50***
	(0.03)			(0.03)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		−0.02		−0.03 ⁺
		(0.02)		(0.02)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.57***		0.34***
		(0.06)		(0.06)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.00	0.00
			(0.01)	(0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.35***	0.17***
			(0.05)	(0.05)
Large	0.44***	0.47***	0.23***	0.74***
	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.05)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	−0.00*	−0.00	−0.00	−0.00 ⁺
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Multinational	5.56***	5.56***	5.55***	5.57***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Delisted	0.99***	1.02***	0.99***	1.01***
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Listed	2.73***	2.80***	2.75***	2.74***
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Sub. of US parent	0.07**	0.07***	0.07**	0.07**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.04*	0.04*	0.04*	0.04*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Intercept	−0.00	−0.02	−0.01	−0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: All models are weighted least squares (WLS). Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 397818. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 4-digit NAICS level.

Intensity of opposition to climate action

Our investigation in the main text of the drivers of membership in coalitions opposed to action to reduce GHG emissions used a dichotomous outcome variable. This variable, $Oppose_f$, equals 1 if a firm ever joined a coalition opposed to climate action. This formulation has the advantage of being robust to the omission of small, undetected coalitions if the members of such coalitions are also members of other coalitions already present in our data. The major disadvantage of this approach is that it does not capture the intensity of firm preferences well. For example, a firm that joins eight coalitions opposed to climate action clearly has revealed a stronger interest in the issue than a firm that has joined only one coalition. Likewise, a firm that is a member of a particular coalition for 20 years has a stronger interest, seemingly, than a firm that dropped into and out of the coalition after only one year.

These considerations suggests a range of possible alternative formulations of the dependent variable, which we investigate here. We first introduce some notation. We let the variable $Oppose_{fcy}$ equal 1 if firm f was a member of opposing coalitions $c \in C$ during one of our sampling years $y(c)$. Note that y is a function of c because different coalitions have different durations. We also use \mathbb{I} as an indicator function which equal 1 if a conditional statement is true. With this notation, the dependent variable used in the bulk of the main text is:

$$Oppose_f = \mathbb{I} \left[\sum_c \sum_{y(c)} Oppose_{fcy} > 0 \right].$$

We can now consider several alternative formulations of the dependent variable which better capture variation in the intensity of preferences across firms. The simplest of these is:

$$\# \text{ Opposing coalitions}_f = \sum_c \mathbb{I} \left[\sum_{y(c)} Oppose_{fcy} \right].$$

This variable counts the number of opposing coalitions that particular firm joined. A replication of the models from Table 2 in the main text is contained in Table B3. Note that we log the outcome variable has a theoretical maximum of $|C| = 22$, and is somewhat skewed because a smaller number of firms join many coalitions. For this reason we log this outcome variable (and add 1 to handle zeroes). We also multiply the logged outcome variable times 100 in order to generate larger coefficients. As such, the coefficients on the carbon-intensity variables should be interpreted as the percentage increase in the number of opposing coalitions joined if a firm's carbon-intensity increases by 100%. Overall, we see a consistently positive relationship between the three forms of carbon intensity and number of memberships in opposing coalitions.

Table B3

	ln (# Opposing coalitions)			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.00 (0.00)			0.00 (0.00)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.20*** (0.01)			0.17*** (0.01)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.00 (0.00)		0.00 (0.00)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.17*** (0.02)		0.09*** (0.02)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.18*** (0.02)	0.12*** (0.02)
Large	0.18*** (0.01)	0.16*** (0.02)	0.13*** (0.01)	0.28*** (0.02)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00* (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00* (0.00)
Multinational	0.83*** (0.03)	0.83*** (0.03)	0.83*** (0.03)	0.83*** (0.03)
Delisted	0.24*** (0.02)	0.24*** (0.02)	0.23*** (0.02)	0.24*** (0.02)
Listed	0.55*** (0.02)	0.58*** (0.02)	0.56*** (0.02)	0.55*** (0.02)
Sub. of US parent	0.07*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)
Intercept	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 397818. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 4-digit NAICS level.

Our second alternative formulation captures the number coalition-years for which a firm was member in a coalition opposed to climate action. The formula for this variable is:

$$\# \text{ Opposing coalition-years}_f = \sum_c \sum_{y(c)} \text{Oppose}_{f_{cy}}.$$

A replication of the models from Table 2 is then provided in Table B4. We again log the outcome and note that the theoretical maximum is greater than $|C| = 22$ because some coalitions are sampled in many years. Table B4 consistently positive relationship between the three forms of carbon intensity and number of membership-years in opposing coalitions.

One objection to the above formulation is that perhaps we don't want to overweight coalitions that have longer tenures (although certainly an argument could be made in the other direction). For this reason, we define a

Table B4

	ln (# Opposing coalition-years)			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.00 (0.00)			0.00 (0.00)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.46*** (0.03)			0.39*** (0.03)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.01 (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.42*** (0.06)		0.24*** (0.06)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.44*** (0.05)	0.30*** (0.05)
Large	0.42*** (0.03)	0.42*** (0.05)	0.32*** (0.03)	0.70*** (0.05)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00* (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00* (0.00)
Multinational	2.10*** (0.07)	2.10*** (0.07)	2.09*** (0.07)	2.10*** (0.07)
Delisted	0.59*** (0.06)	0.61*** (0.06)	0.58*** (0.06)	0.60*** (0.06)
Listed	1.25*** (0.06)	1.31*** (0.06)	1.26*** (0.06)	1.25*** (0.06)
Sub. of US parent	0.17*** (0.02)	0.18*** (0.02)	0.17*** (0.02)	0.17*** (0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.05** (0.02)	0.05** (0.02)	0.05** (0.02)	0.05** (0.02)
Intercept	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 397818. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 4-digit NAICS level.

final version of the outcome capturing intensity:

$$\text{Wtd. opposing coalition-years}_f = \sum_c \sum_{y(c)} \frac{\text{Oppose}_{fcy}}{|y(c)|}$$

where $|y(c)|$ is the cardinality of the set $y(c)$. Note that $\text{Wtd. opposing coalition-years}_f$ is thus on the same scale as $\# \text{ opposing coalitions}_f$, but is weakly smaller, because a firm might not be a member of every coalition for every year of its existence. The results using this final version of the variable are contained in Table ???. We again see the anticipated positive links between carbon intensity and membership in coalition opposing climate action, with the exception Inputs CO₂ intensity has no association with membership in Model 4 which has all measures of carbon intensity.

Table B5

	ln (Wtd. opposing coalition-years)			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.00 (0.00)			0.00 (0.00)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.14*** (0.01)			0.12*** (0.01)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.00 (0.00)		0.00 (0.00)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.10*** (0.02)		0.04* (0.02)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.12*** (0.02)	0.08*** (0.02)
Large	0.12*** (0.01)	0.10*** (0.02)	0.09*** (0.01)	0.18*** (0.02)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00* (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00* (0.00)
Multinational	0.59*** (0.02)	0.59*** (0.02)	0.59*** (0.02)	0.59*** (0.02)
Delisted	0.16*** (0.02)	0.17*** (0.02)	0.16*** (0.02)	0.17*** (0.02)
Listed	0.39*** (0.02)	0.40*** (0.02)	0.39*** (0.02)	0.39*** (0.02)
Sub. of US parent	0.05*** (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.01* (0.01)	0.01** (0.01)	0.01** (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)
Intercept	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 397818. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 4-digit NAICS level.

IV results

One shortcoming in assessing the effects of carbon-intensity on opposition to climate action is that our measures of carbon intensity are driven by both the exogenous technological features of particular industries and the endogenous choices of firms. As a simple illustration of this, suppose that for idiosyncratic reasons firms in some industries have an interest in reducing their carbon footprint to mitigate climatic change. This interest might lead them to both invest in reducing CO₂ emissions and to refrain from public opposition to climate action. These choices would then lead to a positive correlation between CO₂ intensity and opposition to climate action which, in contrast with our preferred explanation, has attitudes driving intensity rather than intensity driving attitudes.

To eliminate this undesired reciprocal causation, we develop an instrumental variable strategy. We conceptualize carbon intensity as being driven by: essentially exogenous technological features of industries; idiosyncratic industry-specific tastes for climate action; and, industry- and country-level expectations about policy change. To instrument for the carbon-intensity of US industries, we employ the most disaggregated available measure of the carbon intensity of industries in the European Union.²⁵⁸ On one hand, we expect that the relatively fixed technological features which drive CO₂ emissions in the US also do so in Europe, so our instrument ought to satisfy the inclusion restriction. On the other hand, we expect that the industry-specific tastes for climate action and industry-specific expectations about climate policy are likely to be only weakly correlated between the US and European industry. Industry-specific policy expectations in the era when carbon intensity is being measured will also be partialled out by the ‘ Δ CO₂ intensity’ variable. We therefore expect that any correlation between EU and US emissions is driven primarily by shared technological features of industries. We also drop all US firms which are the subsidiaries of EU parents and all US firms which own subsidiaries within the EU, to further avoid any contamination of US firms’ preferences in the sample with policy expectations or preferences of EU firms. That being said, we acknowledge international competitive dynamics and technological diffusion are still at play, and may violate the exclusion criterion.

Our instrumental variable results follow our reduced form results in terms of model set-up and control variables. We use as instruments in the first stage analogous versions of CO₂ intensity, Inputs CO₂ intensity, and Downstream CO₂ intensity where the measure of US CO₂ intensity is replaced by the same figure from European Union industries along with their interactions with firm size. We employ weighted two-stage least squares models.

Instrumental variable results In Table B6, we re-examine our main findings using the instrumental variables ap-

²⁵⁸This data comes from Eurostat’s “Air emissions intensities by NACE Rev. 2 activity [env_ac_aeint_r2]” dataset, collected as part of the European environmental economic accounts. To maximize comparability with US emissions data, we selected the EU-wide carbon dioxide intensity (kg of CO₂ per euro (2010 prices) for 2008, the earliest year available.

Table B6: Instrumental variable results on carbon-intensity and opposition

	Oppose			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.00 (0.01)			0.00 (0.01)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.32*** (0.06)			0.03 (0.09)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.02 (0.01)		0.02 (0.02)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.50*** (0.09)		0.38** (0.12)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.61*** (0.07)	0.59*** (0.08)
Large	0.36*** (0.05)	0.50*** (0.07)	0.44*** (0.04)	0.73*** (0.07)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Multinational	1.12*** (0.12)	1.15*** (0.12)	1.12*** (0.12)	1.12*** (0.12)
Delisted	0.73*** (0.07)	0.76*** (0.07)	0.73*** (0.07)	0.75*** (0.07)
Listed	0.49*** (0.07)	0.55*** (0.07)	0.47*** (0.07)	0.49*** (0.07)
Sub. of US parent	0.24*** (0.02)	0.24*** (0.02)	0.24*** (0.02)	0.24*** (0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)
Intercept	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
First stage F tests	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed
Durbin-Wu p-value	0.15	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
Sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: All models are weighted 2-stage least squares, using EU measures of the intensity variables as instruments in the first stage with models otherwise unchanged. Foreign firms and non-goods+ firms are excluded. Unweighted sample size is 2000 politically active firms and 394196 randomly sampled firms, hence $N = 396196$. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness and deleted EU-connected firms. Coefficients in ‘first stage’ OLS models of US intensity variables on EU intensity variables including all controls and sector FE are: .53*** (CO₂ intensity); .68*** (Inputs CO₂ intensity); and .53*** (Downstream CO₂ intensity). “Passed” indicates all instrumental variables, including higher order terms, passed an F-test in the first stage regression.

proach outlined above. First note that all of our instrumental variables pass a standard diagnostic to rule out weak instruments, a series of F tests for first stage regression models to test whether the instrumental variables are significantly predictive of the instrumented variables. We report whether all of these tests were passed or not at the bottom of Table B6. We also provide p-values from a Durbin-Wu test. Overall our main findings are very similar when we instrument the carbon intensity measures of US firms with measures built off of the intensity of EU firms. Our main explanatory variables remain positively linked to opposition to climate action, and the size of the predicted effects are comparable. This improves confidence that our main results are not being driven by the idiosyncratic political preferences or policy expectations of US firms and industries.

Finally, we replicate the IV results from Table B6 but instead using $Lobbyed_f$ as the outcome variable. These models are contained in Table B7.

Table B7: Instrumental variable results on carbon-intensity and lobbying

	Lobby			
	1	2	3	4
CO ₂ intensity	0.00 (0.01)			0.00 (0.01)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.56*** (0.05)			0.41*** (0.07)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.01 (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.77*** (0.06)		0.29*** (0.09)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.01 (0.00)	0.01 (0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large			0.39*** (0.05)	0.23*** (0.06)
Large	0.47*** (0.03)	0.65*** (0.05)	0.27*** (0.03)	0.70*** (0.05)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)	−0.00 (0.00)
Multinational	2.40*** (0.09)	2.46*** (0.09)	2.44*** (0.09)	2.41*** (0.09)
Delisted	0.98*** (0.05)	1.03*** (0.05)	0.98*** (0.05)	1.00*** (0.05)
Listed	0.93*** (0.05)	1.03*** (0.05)	0.96*** (0.05)	0.95*** (0.06)
Sub. of US parent	0.10*** (0.02)	0.10*** (0.02)	0.10*** (0.02)	0.10*** (0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.04* (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)	0.04* (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)
Intercept	−0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.01)
First stage F tests	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed
Durbin-Wu p-value	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
Sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: All models are weighted 2-stage least squares, using EU measures of the intensity variables as instruments in the first stage with models otherwise unchanged. Foreign firms and non-goods+ firms are excluded. Unweighted sample size is 1700 politically active firms and 396118 randomly sampled firms, hence $N = 397818$. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness. Sector fixed effects are at the 2-digit NAICS level. Coefficients in ‘first stage’ OLS models of US intensity variables on EU intensity variables including all controls and sector FE are: .58*** (CO₂ intensity); .58*** (Inputs CO₂ intensity); and .92*** (Downstream CO₂ intensity). “Passed” indicates all instrumental variables, including higher order terms, passed an F-test in the first stage regression.

Carbon intensity and opposition among utilities and utility suppliers

This first table in this section examines CO₂ intensity as a driver of opposition to climate action among utilities firms. We find a strongly positive association, consistent with results from the literature. The second table in this section includes a variable which measures amount of sales to utilities. This is the square root of the share of a firm's outputs that are sold to the utilities industries.

Table B8: Opposition to climate action among utilities firms

	Oppose	
	1	2
CO ₂ intensity	0.12 (0.13)	0.04 (0.13)
CO ₂ intensity · Large	4.94*** (0.54)	3.52*** (0.53)
Large	10.11*** (0.76)	6.10*** (0.77)
Multinational		3.15 (2.35)
Delisted		24.69*** (2.08)
Listed		10.81*** (1.78)
Sub. of US parent		6.35*** (0.75)
Sub. of foreign parent		0.30 (0.85)
Intercept	0.28 (0.20)	0.11 (0.19)

Notes: All models are weighted least squares (WLS). Unweighted sample size is 346 politically active firms and 3387 randomly sampled firms, hence N = 3733 in model 1. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness.

Table B9: Opposition to climate action including measures of sales to utilities

	Oppose	
	1	2
CO ₂ intensity		0.01 (0.00)
CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.43*** (0.04)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		0.00 (0.01)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity · Large		0.34*** (0.07)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity · Large	0.33*** (0.06)	0.16** (0.06)
Utility supplier	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)
Utility supplier · Large	1.00*** (0.12)	1.04*** (0.12)
Large	0.21*** (0.04)	0.68*** (0.06)
Δ CO ₂ intensity	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 ⁺ (0.00)
Multinational	2.23*** (0.08)	2.25*** (0.08)
Delisted	0.64*** (0.07)	0.66*** (0.07)
Listed	1.24*** (0.07)	1.23*** (0.07)
Sub. of US parent	0.22*** (0.02)	0.22*** (0.02)
Sub. of foreign parent	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)
Intercept	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)

Notes: All models are weighted least squares (WLS). Unweighted sample size is 2296 politically active firms and 396013 randomly sampled firms, hence $N = 398309$ in model 1. Sample sizes reflect deleted observations due to missingness.

Outliers and firms that hedge

Outliers In this section we consider briefly outliers – firms that are located in heavily carbon-intensive industries that nonetheless decided to join coalitions that support climate action. By way of example, among firms that joined some coalition in our data and which fall above the 90th percentile for CO₂ intensity, we find that about 107 of 528 joined two or more coalitions that favored climate action (a rate of 20%). The corresponding rates are lower for the 90th percentiles of Inputs carbon-intensity (13%) and Downstream carbon-intensity (12.7%). What might explain this behavior?

One possible explanation is that such firms are subject to different regulatory standards in their alternative markets, for example, if they are foreign and conduct all or most of their operations in home markets with more stringent standards. In Table B10 we examine the subpopulations of firms that are outliers across our three main carbon-intensity variables. We then show the proportion of these firms that are foreign as a function of the number pro-climate action coalitions they have joined. For example, 3% of CO₂ intensive firms that joined no coalitions in favor of climate action are foreign, while 35% that joined more than one pro-action coalition are foreign. Foreign firms are grossly over-represented among our outliers.

We also examine whether publicly-traded firms are more likely to lie among the outliers. This might make sense if publicly traded firms are subject to shareholder pressure to publicly support climate action, for example. We again find that publicly traded firms are grossly over-represented among outliers.

Table B10: Carbon-intensive firms that support action are foreign and/or public

No. favoring coalitions joined	Prop. foreign firms			Prop. public firms		
	0	1	> 1	0	1	> 1
CO ₂ intensity	0.03	0.38	0.35	0.17	0.30	0.48
Inputs CO ₂ intensity	0.07	0.35	0.48	0.20	0.30	0.68
Downstream CO ₂ intensity	0.06	0.38	0.51	0.26	0.32	0.63

Notes: Figures are proportions of firms above the 90th percentile of carbon intensity measures that are foreign (left) or public (right), conditional on number of climate-action favoring coalitions joined.

Hedgers: firms that support and oppose climate action Of the 2396 goods+ firms in our data that opposed or supported climate action at some point, 47 both opposed and supported climate action. Some of these firms are highly active and have clear biases, for example, American Electric Power, Caterpillar and DTE energy joined 9, 9, 4 and opposing coalitions, respectively, but only one supporting coalition. Exelon Corporation (an energy company that produces electricity mainly with nuclear power but also has fossil fuel and alternative energy units) favored climate action in 7 coalitions and opposed in only 1. Others are more balanced in their activities: Duke Energy, Exxon Mobil, 3M, BHP Billiton, Shell Oil, Dow Chemical, BP, and General Motors each joined 2 or more

opposing coalitions and two or more supporting coalitions. This behavior is referred to as 'hedging' in the literature (Meckling, 2015).

Given our focus on opposition to climate action, we investigate in Table B11 why some opposing firms also support climate action. We highlight three findings that strongly reflect our arguments above about outliers. First, publicly traded firms that have opposed action are much more likely to support than private firms. Second, foreign firms are much more likely to support having opposed already. Finally, multinational firms are more likely to do both. This may reflect a complex calculus for companies with multiple units with competing preferences over climate policy. It may also be due to political pressures to support climate action for companies with a large public profile in the US economy and beyond.

Table B11: What firms that oppose climate action also favor it?

	Favor (having already opposed)			
	1	2	3	4
<u>Models examining all firms active on climate issues:</u>				
CO ₂ intensity	0.03 ⁺ (0.02)			0.03 ⁺ (0.02)
Inputs CO ₂ intensity		-0.01 (0.05)		-0.04 (0.05)
Downstream CO ₂ intensity			0.06 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)
Medium	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)
Large	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)
Very large	0.08* (0.04)	0.08* (0.04)	0.08* (0.04)	0.08* (0.04)
Δ CO ₂ Intensity	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Multinational	0.07** (0.02)	0.07** (0.02)	0.07** (0.02)	0.07** (0.02)
Delisted	0.07 ⁺ (0.04)	0.07 (0.04)	0.07 (0.04)	0.08 ⁺ (0.04)
Listed	0.32*** (0.05)	0.32*** (0.05)	0.32*** (0.05)	0.32*** (0.05)
American	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.08 ⁺ (0.04)
Subsidiary	-0.00 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	-0.00 (0.03)	-0.00 (0.03)
Intercept	0.06 (0.11)	0.03 (0.11)	0.06 (0.11)	0.06 (0.11)
Sector FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: All models are weighted least squares (WLS). Sample size is N=535 (in models 1 and 3) and N=399 (in models 2 and 4, where utilities are excluded).

References

Meckling, Jonas. 2015. "Oppose, support, or hedge? Distributional effects, regulatory pressure, and business strategy in environmental politics." *Global Environmental Politics* 15(2):19–37.