

“You are at the Forefront of Progressive National Policy”

Secret e-mails reveal how bureaucrats and environmentalists collude to advance their agenda

By Michael Bastasch and Steven J. Allen

Summary: *If you think that the Environmental Protection Agency is an agency dedicated to protecting the environment, think again. As revealed in secret e-mails and in a report by congressional investigators, the EPA has a “bedfellow” relationship with environmentalists—including billionaires and Hollywood extremists—and the focus of EPA bureaucrats is on the ideological goals they all share.*

The Environmental Protection Agency is so closely aligned with environmentalist groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council that “green” groups in recent years could almost be considered a branch of government. To the three Constitutional branches of government—the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch—one might add the bureaucratic-activist branch.

The two sides of the bureaucratic-activist branch have a revolving-door relationship, with leaders passing back and forth between the bureaucracy and the activist organizations. To a great degree, the policies put forth by government agencies are created by activists. In turn, agencies provide taxpayer funding to the activists. Often, activists sue government officials to put certain policies in effect, and the government officials don’t put up a meaningful defense because they share the agenda of the activists—often their friends and once-and-future colleagues—who are suing them.

Investor’s Business Daily noted in an editorial that, “In recent years, the Environmental Protection Agency has acted less like a part of government and more like an out-of-control arm of the radical green movement. This is another flashing red light for our democracy.” The newspaper attacked “the



President Obama meets at the White House with EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy and with EPA staffers who worked on the measures to destroy coal miners’ jobs and deprive Americans of access to abundant, affordable energy.

EPA’s cozy relationship with the radical National Resources Defense Council—a relationship so close that it’s often hard to say where the EPA ends and the NRDC begins,” adding:

It’s bad enough that an arm of the American government having such sweeping regulatory powers as the EPA can shut down entire sectors of the American economy with so little input from the rest of us.

In this case, it appears to be what lawyers and economists call regulatory capture—that is, when a regulatory agency becomes so beholden to special interests that it no longer acts in the interest of average citizens.

Recently, two efforts have turned a spotlight on the cozy relationship between the EPA and the NRDC and its allies: First, the work of Chris Horner of the Energy

& Environmental Legal Institute (E&E Legal) and the Competitive Enterprise Institute, who has used the Freedom of Information Act to obtain e-mails between EPA officials and private groups. Second, a report by Sen. David Vitter (R-La.) and Republican staffers on the U.S. Senate’s Energy and Public Works Committee.

A shared “progressive” agenda

Whether it’s fracking (hydraulic fractur-

December 2014

“You are at the Forefront of Progressive National Policy”

Page 1

Green Notes

Page 6

ing), coal mining, power plants, offshore drilling, or pipelines, environmentalists have perverted the legal and bureaucratic processes within the EPA to push their own agenda, much of it based on now-discredited views about Global Warming. Environmentalist collusion with the EPA means that a huge portion of the agency's rules and investigations are predetermined to dramatically reduce the use of traditional fuels such as coal and natural gas. The effect is to force a rise in energy prices and to reduce the standard of living of the American people.

Global Warming is the catch-all threat. Anything and everything—hot weather, cold weather, hurricanes, an absence of hurricanes, you name it—is now blamed on fears that the burning of carbon-based fuels is making the world too hot. The panic over Global Warming has given regulators and environmentalists a blank check to control every facet of American industry and life, since there is really nothing we do that doesn't involve carbon dioxide emissions (including breathing).

To us, it's a huge intrusion into our rights and a damper on the free-market economy that made regular working-class people better off than they had ever been in human history. To them, it's a path to a Progressive utopia.

A 2009 internal EPA e-mail chain says it all. In the early days of the Obama administration, on February 27, 2009, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson (using a fake e-mail account in the name of "Richard

Editor: Steven J. Allen

Publisher: Terrence Scanlon

Address: 1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1480

Phone: (202) 483-6900

E-mail: sallen@CapitalResearch.org

Website: CapitalResearch.org

Green Watch is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity. Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

Windsor") wrote EPA policy office head Lisa Heinzerling: "You are at the forefront of progressive national policy on one of the critical issues of our time. Do you realize that?"

"You're a good boss. I do realize that. I pinch myself all the time," Heinzerling replied to Jackson "Windsor."

Said Chris Horner, who dug up the e-mail: "This is not about climate. This is the Progressive agenda."

The "Richard Windsor" e-mail account, named after Jackson's dog and her hometown, was apparently created for the specific purpose of hiding Jackson's e-mails with environmentalist activists. (Government e-mails must be preserved and, under certain circumstances, disclosed to the public.) "Windsor," by the way, was repeatedly cited as an ideal EPA employee, despite the fact that he didn't exist. At one point, he was named as an EPA "scholar of ethical behavior."

Vitter & company investigate

As evidence mounted of improper collusion between EPA officials and private groups, Sen. Vitter and Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, launched an investigation into the influence the Natural Resources Defense Council over the EPA's so-called Clean Power Plan—a contentious rule that aims to cut carbon dioxide emissions from power plants already in operation.

One e-mail suggested collusion between EPA and NRDC in a lawsuit. A 2010 legal settlement between NRDC (and other groups), on one side, and the EPA, on the other side, forced the agency to begin crafting ways to regulate carbon emissions from power plants. Of course, the EPA was being forced to do precisely what it wanted to do—and the e-mails show that. This is a fundamental violation of the rule of law, because lawsuits are only supposed to occur between two parties with a genuine dispute.

After the settlement was announced, NRDC lobbyist David Doniger wrote in December 2010 to the EPA's Gina McCarthy, who then headed the agency's Clean

Air office (and now runs the entire EPA): "Thank you for today's announcement. I know how hard you and your team are working to move us forward and keep us on the rails. This announcement is a major achievement. . . . We will be with you at every step in the year ahead."

McCarthy responded: "Thanks David. I really appreciate your support and your patience. . . . The success is yours as much as mine."

Lawsuits lead to sweetheart settlements in a practice known as "sue and settle." [For more on "sue and settle," see the July 2013 *Green Watch*.]

This e-mail exchange and others have Republican lawmakers concerned that NRDC and possibly other environmental groups played an outsized role in crafting EPA power plant regulations that will force many coal plants to shut down permanently.

"The EPA is clearly allowing the NRDC to assist in drafting federal regulation, with a heavy hand in numerous economically destructive policies," said Vitter. "This influence is putting American families and future generations on the hook for years of lost opportunity and regulatory burden."

The EPA's new power plant rule sets such a low limit for certain "greenhouse gas" emissions that even the most efficient coal-fired power plant cannot meet the standard on its own. To come into compliance, new coal plants would have to install carbon capture and storage technology—technology that has not been proven commercially.

This past summer, the EPA doubled down on its power plant regulations, proposing emissions limits for power plants already in operation. The rule has been extremely controversial, with opponents saying it will raise electricity prices and force more power plants to shut down. The *New York Times* reported that the EPA's carbon plan "could do far more than just shut down coal plants; it could spur a transformation of the nation's electricity sector." Regarding that transformation, David Martosko of the *Daily Mail* wrote:

Such a wholesale shift is high on the list of NRDC's priorities, and its three

lobbyists who wrote the proposal had all the resources they wanted to pull it off, according to an NRDC insider.

‘This was the most talked-about thing going on inside the organization,’ the veteran D.C. activist told MailOnline. ‘Nothing else we were doing—not pollution control or ESA [Endangered Species Act] work or marine protected areas—nothing had as much juice behind it.’

‘Of course, fundraising was always a trump card, but other than that, the carbon policy team got everything it wanted and pretty much had a blank check.’

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the carbon rules would destroy 2.3 million jobs, and the ten-year cost to the economy would be half a trillion dollars (or more than \$6,000 for the average family of four).

A report on the EPA proposal by the Pacific Research Institute looked at annual electricity spending for an average African-American household in Ohio and found that it will rise from 4.5 percent of income to 5.8 percent. (A side note: In a statement full of scientific errors, including confusing carbon dioxide with “carbon pollution” and blaming hurricanes on carbon dioxide, NAACP Interim President Lorraine Miller backed the rules, proclaiming them “a bold step for environmental justice in protecting our most vulnerable communities. African Americans overwhelming live in areas where millions of tons of carbon pollution are trapping, concentrating, and intensifying the myriad of toxins they breathe every day. And as we have witnessed with natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina and Sandy, which are part of a pattern of shifting climate conditions driven by power plant emissions of carbon dioxide, our black and brown communities are being hit first and the worst.”)

The three horsemen

Concerns about the incestuous relationship between the EPA and the NRDC seem to have been confirmed in a *New York Times* piece by environmentalist and *Times* reporter Coral Davenport:

In November 2010, three combatants gathered in a sleek office here to build a carbon emissions policy that they hoped to sell to the Obama administration.

One was a lawyer who had been wielding the Clean Air Act since his days at the University of California, Berkeley. Another had turned to practicing environmental law and writing federal regulations to curb pollution after spending a summer on a pristine island off Nova Scotia. The third, a climate scientist who is a fixture on Capitol Hill, became an environmentalist because of postcollege backpacking trips in the Rockies.

Those three men, David Doniger, David Hawkins, and Daniel Lashof, were the lead authors of a 110-page proposal that, according to the *Times*, the EPA “used as its blueprint” for the President’s 650-page proposal to “curb power plant emissions.” All three were at the Natural Resources Defense Council, although Lashof later left NRDC to join NextGen Climate, the pressure group founded by billionaire activist Tom Steyer. They traveled the country to promote their plan.

To perform the statistical analysis underlying the plan, the NRDC spent “a few hundred thousand dollars,” according to Doniger, to hire the same statistics firm used by the EPA. That would help ensure that the analysis was consistent—that, in the common phrase, everyone was singing from the same page. (It was a process similar to the one that occurred in the development of the Obamacare program, in which Obamacare supporters consistently relied on the analysis of the political activist and MIT economist Jonathan Gruber.)

According to Davenport, the Obama administration’s proposal, released in June, represented

a remarkable victory for the Natural Resources Defense Council, the longtime home of Mr. Doniger and Mr. Hawkins and, until recently, of Mr. Lashof. The organization has a reach that extends from the big donors of Wall Street to the elite of Hollywood (Leonardo DiCaprio and Robert Redford are on its board) to the far corners

of the Environmental Protection Agency, where Mr. Doniger and Mr. Hawkins once worked.

NRDC is beloved among members of the Hollywood elite. The TV comedies “How I Met Your Mother” and “Curb Your Enthusiasm” repeatedly put forth NRDC as an example of a civic-minded organization that was trying to save the planet. And the group’s Hollywood connections help it raise a lot of money. According to Davenport:

[B]oard members like Mr. DiCaprio and Mr. Redford . . . are the attractions at lavish fund-raising galas for studio heads and Silicon Valley magnates. In a typical event in 2011, guests at the Malibu home of Ron Meyer, now the vice chairman of NBCUniversal, sipped Champagne and watched surfers paddle out to form a peace sign in the Pacific Ocean. The event raised \$2.6 million.

The council’s fund-raising office in New York has also found big donors in the business world, including at Google and Goldman Sachs. “With NRDC, I would like to think I’m getting the best bang for the buck,” said Alan F. Horn, the chairman of Walt Disney Studios and a member of the group’s board. “These people are steeped in expertise.”

Walt Disney Studios, it should be noted, is a sister organization of ABC News, and NBCUniversal is the parent of NBC News. Those news organizations often promote environmentalist views on Global Warming and other issues.

NRDC is infamous for its involvement in national security affairs as well as environmental issues. For example, it played a key role during the Cold War in covering up the use by Soviet clients of chemical/biological weapons, illegal under international law, against the Afghan people and in Laos against the Hmong people. The group also attempted to block the Navy from conducting war games involving high intensity sonar off the coast of California.

The Vitter report

According to a report by Sen. Vitter and his

committee staff, “The first step in understanding the relationship and money flow between the environmental groups, the billionaires, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), along with other agencies, is to look at the strategy used to shrink the economy and deindustrialize the United States. . . . [Environmentalists’] money trail is hidden to project the false notion that the environmental movement is a spontaneous and locally controlled effort.”

The Vitter report documented the “prescriptive grantmaking” (i.e., money with strings attached) that flows from a “Billionaire’s Club” that “colludes with far-left environmental activists and government officials.” Ron Arnold wrote in the *Washington Examiner* about the spotlight thrown by the Vitter report on

the Environmental Grantmakers Association, a veteran organization (founded 1985) of more than 200 ultra-wealthy foundations caught in the spotlight of a new 92-page report exposing Big Green wealth eating away America’s industrial strength.

This is the same EGA that emerged during the Senate confirmation hearings for Rhea Sun Suh, the Interior Department’s new head of national parks and the Fish and Wildlife Service—a veteran EGA member who invited colleagues to come visit her any time.

Suh once worked for the Packard Foundation on programs to block oil and gas production in the West. Ironically, Packard’s investment portfolio—the profits from which the foundation pays its anti-oil and gas grants—holds more than \$350,000 in ExxonMobil shares, and millions in dozens of other lesser-known fossil fuel securities.

Arnold noted one example of how the system works, as detailed in the Vitter report:

The collusion is like something out of a bad spy movie. Vitter’s oversight team uncovered a June 2009 deal in which the Rockefeller Family Fund offered then-EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson to pay for a plant inside the President’s Council on Environmental Quality to “stake the EPA’s claim there,” and then slip the shill into a pre-

arranged EPA job, giving the agency a White House insider on staff—and, not coincidentally, tightening the Rockefeller power grip over the EPA.

Jackson wrote her chief of staff Diane Thompson, “I think it’s a fine idea and can only help EPA in the long run”—using her fake Richard Windsor email account—and Thompson replied, “My thoughts exactly. The more inside connections the better.”

A transcript of an early Environmental Grantmakers Association strategy meeting contains a conversation about how funders can reorganize the environmental movement. Donald Ross, who at the time represented the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, argued that funders should craft a “task force approach” to allocate resources. “Funders can play a role in using money to drive, to create, ad hoc efforts, in many cases that will have a litigation component coming from one group, a lobbying component coming from another group, a grassroots organizing component from yet a third group with a structure that enables them to function well.”

More from Ron Arnold’s comments on the Vitter report:

The Rockefeller shill was Shalini Vajjhala, who agreed to leave her minor position at Resources for the Future, a Washington think tank, for a two-month stint at the CEQ (with the pretentious title of “deputy associate director for energy and climate”). Then the EPA slipped her in as deputy assistant administrator of the Office of International & Tribal Affairs. Vajjhala remained until her 2011 appointment as EPA’s special representative leading a presidential U.S.-Brazil initiative.

After Vajjhala cycled through the White House and EPA, she got her personal reward in 2012: approval to found and manage a new investment portfolio supported by the Rockefeller Foundation (the original 1913 John D. Rockefeller philanthropy, not the fourth generation’s Family Fund—there are many Rockefeller tentacles). Vajjhala now contributes to the Huffington Post, funded in part by the Park Foundation.

In a similar vein, the *Washington Times* described a revelation in the Vitter report about an aspect of the relationship between EPA and the radical Sierra Club:

In one batch of messages, Sierra Club lobbyists delivered biased research that eager EPA officials snapped up as justification to shut down coal plants. To avoid scrutiny and evade the agency’s visitors log, outside activists and government employees met across the street from EPA headquarters at the J.W. Marriott Hotel. Over coffee, they plotted what they wanted to do, how to do it, and decided the best locations for EPA hearings.

Government officials reciprocated with advance notice of regulatory actions that gave the groups a head start on organizing the appearance of grassroots support. Sierra Club employees were even allowed to distribute T-shirts at EPA headquarters.

More than a year of wrangling and court battles were required to obtain the e-mails that describe how the EPA does its shady business. Lisa P. Jackson, the former administrator of the EPA, concealed her participation behind the e-mail pseudonym “Richard Windsor.” That kept public information requests from finding, for example, an e-mail congratulating Al Armendariz, a regional EPA administrator, on his new job. “I just got a call from the Sierra Club,” the email to Mrs. Jackson said. “Al has accepted a job with the Sierra Club, and will run their anti-coal campaign in the Texas region.”

Regular readers of this publication will recognize the name of Armendariz, then the Region VI Administrator. He’s the one who got caught describing, in a 2010 video, his approach to dealing with companies regulated by EPA: “I was in a meeting once and I gave an analogy to my staff about my philosophy of enforcement, and I think it was probably a little crude and maybe not appropriate for the meeting, but I’ll go ahead and tell you what I said: It was kind of like how the Romans used to, you know, conquer villages in the Mediterranean. They’d go in to a little Turkish town somewhere, they’d find the first five

guys they saw and they'd crucify them. Then, you know, that town was really easy to manage for the next few years."

Washington Times reporter Kellan Howell wrote of the Vitter report:

Some of the key issues covered in the report include potential tax status violations, questionable offshore funding, and revolving-door politics within the EPA.

"What this report shows is that eco-left billionaires, including those like Tom Steyer who made their money in fossil fuels, have managed to hijack an entire government agency," said Michael Sandoval, an energy policy analyst at the free-market Independence Institute in Denver. . . .

The report cited a group called Bold Nebraska as an example of a local "homegrown" environmental group receiving millions in out-of-state funding.

According to the committee report, Bold Nebraska, a group opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline, received \$140,000 from the California-based Tides Foundation between 2010 and 2013. In addition, the Tides Foundation funneled \$2.4 million to The Advocacy Fund, a San Francisco 501(c)(4) which in turn gave another \$15,000 to Bold Nebraska.

"While Bold Nebraska is essentially a tool for the Billionaires' Club and their allies opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline, many in the state remain oblivious to this fact," the committee report says.

Another example from the Vitter report: "Between 2010 and 2012, both foundations (Hewlett Foundation and Packard Foundation) donated hundreds of millions of dollars to Climate Works Foundation, a 501(c)(3) foundation. ClimateWorks then gave nearly \$170 million to the Energy Foundation. Hewlett and Packard gave directly to the Energy Foundation. The Energy Foundation then gave \$5,676,000 to Green Tech, and ClimateWorks gave it \$1,520,000. The Energy Foundation was incredibly brief, broad and vague in describing the purpose of its 2011 and 2012

grants of \$1 million, respectively, to Green Tech." Green Tech, in turn, donated heavily to "at least three far-left environmental activist organizations during the 2010 and 2012 election cycles."

A "revolving door" exists between environmentalist organizations and the top positions at EPA and the Interior Department, according to the report. In turn, government grants go to the NRDC, the Environmental Defense Fund, local groups such as the Louisiana Bucket Brigade, and many other "green" groups.

Meanwhile, "Some of the most valued services activists provide the Billionaire's Club include promulgation of propaganda, which creates an artificial echo chamber, appearance of a faux grassroots movement, access to nimble and transient groups under fiscal sponsorship arrangements, distance/anonymity between donations made by well-known donors and activities of risky activist groups and above all—the ability to leverage tens of millions of dollars in questionable foreign funding."

Transparency, or lack thereof

John Hayward wrote in *Human Events* about a report by the Energy and Environment Legal Institute ("E&E Legal") based on e-mails between the EPA and environmentalists.

President Obama boasted, "On my first day in office, we closed the revolving door between lobbying firms and the government so that no one in my administration would make decisions based on the interests of former or future employers." The truth, as this report documents, is quite different.

. . . Contrary to the Administration's public assurances that it wasn't waging a 'War on Coal,' the EPA and its beloved green lobbyists most certainly thought they were fighting such a war.

For example, even as the White House was denying it declared a War on Coal, EPA Administration Gina McCarthy was describing one of her top contacts at the Sierra Club as their "no coal person," in charge of an "anti-coal campaign" viewed quite favorably by the Agency.

The relationship between lobbyist and government agency was so tight then when No Coal Guy went on vacation, his associates at the Sierra Club "would plead with EPA friends for updates, on the grounds that his absence left them feeling out of EPA's loop. Then you've got people like Al Armendariz, an EPA regional administrator "who, in the words of his EPA colleagues, departed for Sierra Club to 'run their anti-coal campaign,' in the very region where he until then ran EPA's anti-coal campaign, with the very same groups he had been working with." Change your tie clip and ID badge, and—presto!—you go from being a government official lobbied by green groups to a green activist lobbying the people who were working across the hall from you at EPA headquarters last month.

[For more on this from E&E Legal, see last month's *Green Watch*.]

"This is a complicated, layered system intended to muddy up where the dollars end up and the activity it engenders," Vitter said. "There is no way a reasonable person could look at this and not conclude part of the intent is to create a lack of transparency."

As Obamacare architect Jonathan Gruber said famously regarding his program:

Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage, and basically, y'know, call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but basically that was really, really critical to get anything to pass. . . . Look, I wish . . . we could make it all transparent, but I'd rather have this law than not.

To Progressives, the ends justify the means. Lack of transparency—hiding the relationship between ideological activists and government officials, and misleading people about science and about the goals of government policies—well, in Washington, that's just how they do business.

Michael Bastasch is a reporter for the Daily Caller News Foundation. Dr. Steven J. Allen (J.D., Ph.D.) is editor of Green Watch.

GW

GreenNotes

The **Gunnison sage-grouse** wasn't even classified as a species until 2000, but it's already causing problems in **Colorado** and **Utah**. The **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service** announced, a week after the midterm election, that it was designating the bird, which is related to the **prairie chicken**, as a "threatened" species, likely leading to restrictions in an area of 2,200 square miles on such activities as hunting, residential development, road-building, ranching, power-line construction, and energy exploration. Even Colorado's Democratic **Gov. John Hickenlooper** denounced the decision; he threatened to sue.

Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), chairman of the **House Natural Resources Committee**, said the decision "foreshadows the intentions of the **Obama administration**" with regard to the **greater sage-grouse**, a closely related bird (until recently, classified in the same species as the Gunnison) that is under consideration for "protected" status in an area of 290,000 square miles covering parts of 11 states. That area is about eight percent bigger than **Texas**. As the result of a "sue and settle" lawsuit, the administration is on track to make quick decisions on 252 species under consideration for "protection." [For a report on the corrupt practice of "sue and settle," see the July 2013 issue of *Green Watch*.]

In the October issue of our sister publication **Labor Watch**, we reported on the scandal in which veterans were denied care by the **Department of Veterans Affairs** while some VA employees were paid by taxpayers to work full time for unions. That's not the only way VA wastes money. The **Washington Times** notes that former **VA Secretary Eric Shinseki** "traveled the country to boast of the green initiative" run by the department's **Office of Green Management Programs**. In 2011, he "traveled to **Massachusetts** to flick the switch at a half-million-dollar windmill project at the **Massachusetts National Cemetery**. . . . VA facilities have become littered with every scheme to banish carbon dioxide short of requiring visitors to hold their breath. **Calverton National Cemetery** spent \$742,034 on solar panels. **Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery** spent \$787,308. Not to be out-greened, the **Riverside National Cemetery** spent \$1.3 million on its solar system. At the **Phoenix VA Health Care System**, where 20 Americans died from incompetence and cover-up, the department spent \$20 million putting solar panels on the hospital roofs. That would have been more than enough money to provide the veterans with the health care they deserved."

Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti (D) is calling on **Angelenos** to cut their water use by 20 percent by 2016. Meanwhile, according to the **L.A. Weekly**, the mayor's mansion uses 2,100 gallons of water a day—about 5.4 times the household average for the city.

California Gov. Jerry Brown (D) won a fourth term on Election Day despite, or because of, his penchant for wacky statements about the environment—claiming, for example, that, within a couple of hundred years, **Los Angeles International Airport** could be under water due to Global Warming. Actually, at the current rate of increase in the sea level, submerging LAX would take about 46,000 years. (According to a 1969 memo by **Daniel Patrick Moynihan**, a top aide to **President Nixon** and a future Democratic Senator from **New York**, environmentalists predicted at that time that **New York City** and **Washington, D.C.** would be beneath the waves by the year 2000.)

Fracking bans passed in two very liberal California counties (**San Benito** and **Mendocino**) but failed in **Santa Barbara** 63-37, even though **Democrats** outnumber **Republicans** there by 11 points. **Allysia Finley** of the **Wall Street Journal** predicted that the Santa Barbara defeat will "put the kibosh" on the prospect that billionaire **Tom Steyer** would fund a campaign for a statewide ban. Some observers speculate that Steyer will run for governor in 2018.

Global Warming—or "climate change," or "climate chaos," or "extreme weather," or whatever fake "scientific consensus" they're citing this week—turned out to be a loser among voters. How big a loser? In the pivotal Colorado race for the **U.S. Senate**, Steyer's group, **NextGen Climate Action**, funded an ad attacking the GOP candidate, **Cory Gardner**, not for his position on "green" issues, but for supposedly wanting to abolish birth control. (In fact, Gardner, who won, favors over-the-counter sales of birth control.)

Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), a radical environmentalist, wasn't on the ballot this year but was a big loser anyway. With Republicans taking the Senate, she'll lose the chair of the committee that oversees environmental policy. The new chairman: **Jim Inhofe** (R-Okla.), whom environmentalists label a "denier" (i.e., he favors the use of real science on the Global Warming issue). Leftists are laying plans to monitor every statement Inhofe makes, looking for fodder with which to attack Republicans.

Supporters of the Keystone pipeline already had a majority in the **House of Representatives**. In the Senate, they're one vote short of the required 60 votes needed to stop a filibuster, and, once the new senators take office in January, they'll have a filibuster-proof majority. That will likely force President Obama to veto the project. An official at an environmentalist group told **Politico**, "We're gearing up for this, and that's what we're good at, turning people out into the street. We know how to fight this fight."