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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In his 2010 State of the Union Address, President Obama famously chided the Supreme Court for its recent campaign finance decision by proclaiming, “With all due deference to the separation of powers, the Supreme Court reversed a century of law to open the floodgates for special interests – including foreign corporations – to spend without limit in our elections.”¹ In another speech he further lamented, “There aren’t a lot of functioning democracies around the world that work this way where you can basically have millionaires and billionaires bankrolling whoever they want, however they want, in some cases undisclosed. What it means is ordinary Americans are shut out of the process.”²

These statements are remarkable for their blatant hypocrisy and obfuscation of the fact that the President and his cadre of wealthy liberal allies and donors embrace the very tactics he publicly scorned. In reality, an elite group of left wing millionaires and billionaires, which this report refers to as the “Billionaire’s Club,” who directs and controls the far-left environmental movement, which in turn controls major policy decisions and lobbies on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Even more unsettling, a dominant organization in this movement is Sea Change Foundation, a private California foundation, which relies on funding from a foreign company with undisclosed donors. In turn, Sea Change funnels tens of millions of dollars to other large but discreet foundations and prominent environmental activists who strive to control both policy and politics.

This report examines in detail the mechanisms and methods of a far-left environmental machine that has been erected around a small group of powerful and active millionaires and billionaires who exert tremendous sway over a colossal effort. Although startling in its findings, the report covers only a small fraction of the amount of money that is being secreted and moved around. It would be virtually impossible to examine this system completely given the enormity of this carefully coordinated effort and the lack of transparency surrounding it.

The failure to openly acknowledge this force and the silence of the media with whom they coordinate further emphasize the fact that until today, the Billionaire’s Club operated in relative obscurity hidden under the guise of “philanthropy.” The scheme to keep their efforts hidden and far removed from the political stage is deliberate, meticulous, and intended to mislead the public. While it is uncertain why they operate in the shadows and what they are hiding, what is clear is that these individuals and foundations go to tremendous lengths to avoid public association with the far-left environmental movement they so generously fund.

The report attempts to decipher the patterns of “charitable giving.” Often the wealthiest foundations donate large sums to intermediaries – sometimes a pass through and sometimes a fiscal sponsor. The intermediary then funnels the money to other 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations that the original foundation might also directly support. The report offers theories

---

that could explain this bizarre behavior, but at its core, the Billionaire’s Club is not, and seemingly does not, want to be transparent about the groups they fund and how much they are supporting them.

In advancing their cause, these wealthy liberals fully exploit the benefits of a generous tax code meant to promote genuine philanthropy and charitable acts, amazingly with little apparent Internal Revenue Service scrutiny. Instead of furthering a noble purpose, their tax deductible contributions secretly flow to a select group of left wing activists who are complicit and eager to participate in the fee-for-service arrangement to promote shared political goals. Moreover, the financial arrangement provides significant insulation to these wealthy elite from the incidental damage they do to the U.S. economy and average Americans.

Through these arrangements, the Billionaire’s Club gains access to a close knit network of likeminded funders, environmental activists, and government bureaucrats who specialize in manufacturing phony “grassroots” movements and in promoting bogus propaganda disguised as science and news to spread an anti-fossil energy message to the unknowing public. Not only is the system incredibly sophisticated, but the Club’s attorneys and accountants have mastered the loopholes and gray areas in the tax code, which enable them to obtain a full tax benefit, even when the recipient of the grant is not recognized as a public charity, and even if the money indirectly and impermissibly funds political activities.

In order to understand how the Billionaire’s Club colludes with the far-left environmental activists and government officials, the report articulates the fundamental framework that governs these relationships. Essentially, the far-left environmental machine is comprised of hundreds of nonprofit organizations. Each entity is set up according to its designated purpose and is either a private foundation or a public charity, depending on where the cog fits in this well-designed wheel.

The facilitators – both organizations and individuals who bring together the private foundations and the activists – are a key component of the movement’s success. The report identifies three organizations that serve prominent roles as facilitators: the Environmental Grantmakers Association, the Democracy Alliance, and the Divest/Invest movement. There is also a narrow set of individuals whose careers are part of the fabric of the far-left environmental movement and who serve as coordinators and intermediaries between the Billionaire’s Club and the activist groups.

The ultimate recipients of donations from the Billionaire’s Club work in tandem with wealthy donors to maximize the value of their tax deductible donations and leverage their combined resources to influence elections and policy outcomes. Often, they lobby on behalf of the EPA and advance policy positions important to the agency, which is statutorily prohibited from lobbying on its own behalf. But most importantly, they serve as the face of the environmental movement and present themselves as non-partisan benevolent charities to a public not aware of the secretive backroom deals and transfers.

The Billionaire’s Club achieves many of its successes through the “capture” of key employees at EPA. These “successes” are often at the expense of farmers, miners, roughnecks,
small businesses, and families. This report proves that the Obama EPA has been deliberately staffed at the highest levels with far-left environmental activists who have worked hand-in-glove with their former colleagues. The green-revolving door at EPA has become a valuable asset for the far-left and their wealthy donors. In addition to providing insider access to important policy decisions, it appears activists now at EPA also funnel government money through grants to their former employers and colleagues. The report tracks the amount of government aid doled out to activist groups and details a troubling disregard for ethics by certain high powered officials.

The report further describes what the Billionaire’s Club is purchasing with their fortunes. It reveals that activists are skilled at creating and pushing out propaganda disguised as science and news. For example, both the Park Foundation and the Schmidt Family Foundation have financed questionable scientists to produce anti-fracking research, which the Huffington Post, Mother Jones, and Climate Desk – all grant recipients themselves – eagerly report on.

The Billionaire’s Club has also perfected the craft of assembling and funding fake grassroots movements to assist in ballot measures and other state initiatives. The efforts in New York and Colorado to ban fracking are prime examples. The report explains how these faux grassroots efforts are actually funded by foundations outside the states they seek to influence. All these groups are similarly utilizing their platform to attack jobs, economic development, and infrastructure projects across the country.

The Energy Foundation is a quintessential example of a pass through frequently employed by the Billionaire’s Club. Energy Foundation receives money from several key foundations and redirects it to activists. In doing so, they are providing two services: distance between the donor and the activist, and enhancing the clout of the donors as their individual influence is maximized by pooling resources. One of the major funders of the Energy Foundation is Sea Change, which has gone to great lengths to hide the source of its money. This is especially concerning in light of recent revelations that environmental activists do not appear to be morally conflicted over where their money comes from – so long as it supports their goals.

The Billionaire’s Club is also adept at converting charitable donations into political outcomes by taking advantage of loopholes in the tax code. Numerous examples raise questions as to whether the charitable donations are indirectly supporting political activity. For example, in many cases they fund a 501(c)(3), like the Energy Foundation or the League of Conservation Voters, which then transfers large sums to an affiliated 501(c)(4), which can engage in political activity. The affiliated groups often share office space, staff, and even board members. In the case of the 501(c)(4) Green Tech Action Fund, which received donations from the Energy Foundation, and in turn, donated funds to 501(c)(4) far-left environmental activist organizations.

The evidence provided in this report highlights the lengths the far-left environmental movement goes to hide sources of funding and to disguise their actions – bought and paid for by millionaires and billionaires – as charitable acts in service of their fellow man. This report outlines a sampling of the individuals, foundations, and practices that are active in our political system today, shedding light on just a fraction of the activities of the far-left environmental machine that undermines American free enterprise and resource security.
FINDINGS:

• The “Billionaire’s Club,” an exclusive group of wealthy individuals, directs the far-left environmental movement. The members of this elite liberal club funnel their fortunes through private foundations to execute their personal political agenda, which is centered around restricting the use of fossil fuels in the United States. (Pg. 6)

• The Billionaire’s Club has established a dozen prominent private foundations with huge sums of money at their disposal to spend on environmental causes. (Pg. 9)

• Members of the Billionaire’s Club also donate directly to 501(c)(3) public charities. Generally, the public charity is considered the preferred status under the tax code, based on the greater tax benefits and protections on donor disclosures. (Pg. 10)

• Public charities attempt to provide the maximum amount of control to their donors through fiscal sponsorships, which are a legally suspect innovation unique to the left, whereby the charity actually sells its nonprofit status to a group for a fee. (Pg. 12)

• Nearly all of the public charities discussed in this report have an affiliated 501(c)(4) that engages in activities designed to influence elections and have no restrictions on their lobbying efforts. The funding of a 501(c)(4) by a 501(c)(3) affiliates is provocative in light of the legal restrictions on public charities from participating in political campaigning, either directly or indirectly, while permitting a 501(c)(4) to significantly engage in campaign activities. (Pg. 14)

• Members of the Billionaire’s Club put a premium on access to the complex environmental infrastructure that has evolved to leverage substantial assets towards achieving defined policy outcomes. (Pg. 16)

• Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) is a place where wealthy donors meet and coordinate the distribution of grants to advance the environmental movement. EGA encourages the use of prescriptive grantmaking. It is a secretive organization, refusing to disclose their membership list to Congress. (Pg. 16)

• Democracy Alliance (DA), a facilitator for wealthy donors seeking to advance a broader far-left agenda, does not disclose the details of any transaction it facilitates, and its members and donor-recipients cannot speak publically about the organization. (Pg. 18)

• Environmental activist groups are well aligned with the greater far-left agenda. One of DA’s acclaimed successes in the last year includes President Obama’s executive actions on climate change. (Pg. 20)

• Many far-left environmental foundations and groups have pledged to divest in fossil fuels and invest in renewable projects as well as “philanthropy.” (Pg. 22)
• There is a narrow set of individuals whose careers are part of the fabric of the far-left environmental movement. These individuals exercise outsized influence regarding the distribution of funds. (Pg. 23)

• Public charity activist groups propagate the false notion that they are independent, citizen-funded groups working altruistically. In reality, they work in tandem with wealthy donors to maximize the value of the donors’ tax deductible donations and leverage their combined resources to influence elections and policy outcomes, with a focus on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (Pg. 25)

• Far-left environmental activists, while benefiting from nonprofit status, essentially sell a product to wealthy foundations who are seeking to drive policy and political outcomes. (Pg. 38)

• The Obama Administration has installed an audacious green-revolving door among senior officials at EPA, which has become a valuable asset for the environmental movement and its wealthy donors. (Pg. 28)

• In one example, senior EPA officials planned to use Michelle DePass’s position on the Board of Directors of EGA, her eminent employment at EPA, and her relationship with former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson, to enhance her influence with EGA. (Pg. 29)

• Former far-left environmentalists working at EPA funnel government money through grants to their former employers and colleagues, often contributing to the bottom line of environmental activist groups. (Pg. 34)

• Under President Obama, EPA has given more than $27 million in taxpayer-funded grants to major environmental groups. Notably, the Natural Resources Defense Council and Environmental Defense Fund – two key activists groups with significant ties to senior EPA officials – have collected more than $1 million in funding each. (Pg. 34)

• EPA Region 2 Administrator Judith Enck appears to be inappropriately and personally involved in the allocation of EPA grants to favored groups. Enck is also the subject of an inquiry led by the EPA Office of Inspector General. (Pg. 35)

• EPA also gives grants to lesser-known extreme groups. For example, the Louisiana Bucket Brigade received hundreds of thousands of dollars under former Administrator Lisa Jackson despite challenges by state regulators over the use of such grants. (Pg. 33)

• Some of the most valued services activists provide the Billionaire’s Club includes 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. (Pg. 38)
• Foundations finance research to justify desired predetermined policy outcome. The research is then reported on by a news outlet, oftentimes one that is also supported by the same foundation, in an effort to increase visibility. In one example, a story reporting on a Park Foundation-supported anti-fracking study was reproduced by a Park-funded news organization through a Park-funded media collaboration where it was then further disseminated on Twitter by the maker of Park-backed anti-fracking movies. (Pg. 41)

• Another service provided to the Billionaire’s Club is the manufacturing of an artificial grassroots movement where it is not the citizen’s interest that drives the movement; rather, it is part of a well-funded national strategy. (Pg. 43)

• In New York and Colorado, a pseudo grassroots effort to attack hydraulic fracturing has germinated from massive amounts of funding by the NY-based Park Foundation, as well as CA-based Schmidt Family Foundation and Tides Foundation. (Pg. 44)

• The same California and New York-based foundations behind the New York anti-fracking efforts have shifted to Colorado through two coalitions – Local Control Colorado and Frack Free Colorado. (Pg. 45)

• Bold Nebraska is another example of faux grassroots where a purportedly local organization is, in fact, an arm of the Billionaire’s Club. It is nothing more than a shield for wealthy and distant non-Nebraskan interests who seek to advance a political agenda without drawing attention to the fact that they, too, are outsiders with little connection to the state. (Pg. 50)

• The Energy Foundation is a pass through public charity utilized by the most powerful EGA members to create the appearance of a more diversified base of support, to shield them from accountability, and to leverage limited resources by hiring dedicated energy/environment staff to handle strategic giving. (Pg. 51)

• The Energy Foundation is the largest recipient of grants from the foreign-funded Sea Change Foundation; yet, it appears the Energy Foundation attempts to hide donations from Sea Change, as it is not listed as one of Energy Foundation’s partners. (Pg. 53)

• The circumstances surrounding the flow of money from 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) groups, and the likelihood of lax oversight, raises questions as to whether 501(c)(3) nonprofit foundations and charities are indirectly funding political activities. (Pg. 56)

• 501(c)(4) Green Tech Action Fund receives millions of dollars from green 501(c)(3) organizations, then distributes the funds to other 501(c)(4) groups that donate to political campaigns. (Pg. 57)

• Many of the large environmental organizations form both 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) nonprofits that are publically advertised as separate and independent entities. In reality, they are closely associated groups that transfer money from the Billionaire’s Club to nonprofits, and eventually into political campaigns. (Pg. 58)
• Between 2010 and 2012, Tides Foundation gave over $10 million to Tides Center, and Tides Center gave over $39 million to Tides Foundation. It is unclear what purpose the transfer of funds between these two organizations serves, other than obscuring the money trail. (Pg. 60)

• Tides Center is a fiscal sponsor to over 200 groups, which are subject to Tides Center’s oversight and direction in important aspects that include forming a governing board, managing payroll, and monitoring risk. (Pg. 60).

• The New York-based Sustainable Markets Foundation is also a significant fiscal sponsor and receives vast sums from the Billionaire’s Club. It only exists on paper and has zero public presence – no website, no Facebook page, no Twitter account, nothing. (Pg. 64)

• The Billionaire’s Club knowingly collaborates with questionable offshore funders to maximize support for the far-left environmental movement. (Pg. 65)

• The little information available on Sea Change is limited to a review of its IRS Form-990 for 2010 and 2011 as its 2012 form is not public, and a sparsely worded website – listing solely the logo and a three-sentence mission statement. (Pg. 65)

• Klein Ltd., an overseas company contributing tens of millions to organizations dedicated to abolishing the use of affordable fossil fuels through a U.S. private foundation is highly problematic. This is only compounded by the fact that it is deliberately and completely lacking in transparency – having no website and withholding its funders. (Pg. 68)
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INTRODUCTION

The “Billionaire’s Club,” an exclusive group of wealthy individuals, directs the far-left environmental movement. The members of this elite liberal club funnel their fortunes through private foundations to execute their personal political agenda, which is centered around restricting the use of fossil fuels primarily in the United States.

This report demonstrates that, far from pursuing philanthropic goals, the money from this elite group is funneled to like-minded activists in a defined fee-for-service arrangement. Fiscal sponsorships, a legally suspect vehicle for charitable funding, allows new and transient groups the ability to receive foundation funding while quickly mobilizing in local communities to provide rapid response services where their ability to affect public change is greatest.

The Billionaire’s Club has formed exclusive networks and alliances – in and out of the federal government – to maximize the effectiveness of its “investment.” One such outfit is the Environmental Grantmakers Association – command central of the environmental movement. It is also very secretive, refusing to disclose their membership list to Congress. The wealthy liberal elite have also formed public charities, including the Energy Foundation, the ClimateWorks Foundation, the Sustainable Markets Foundation, and the Tides Center, to coordinate and leverage their expenditures. Moreover, efforts like the recently exposed Democracy Alliance and the Divest/Invest Movement have pooled hundreds of millions of dollars in collective resources to funnel funds towards chosen activists.

The Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, League of Conservation Voters, Center for Biological Diversity, National Wildlife Federation, World Wildlife Fund, and other environmental activist organizations serve as the face of the movement and provide cover for where the secretive foundations direct their resources.

Klein Ltd., a foreign corporation, has risen to prominence in the far-left environmental community – doling out tens of millions to favored charities via Sea Change Foundation. In fact, none of this foreign corporation’s funding is disclosed in any way. This is clearly a deceitful way to hide the source of millions of dollars that are active in our system, attempting to effect political change.

Finally, the success of this movement is hinged on direct access to policy makers who are loyal to the cause and work to implement the far-left environmental agenda when they occupy government positions. Relationships with policy makers provide the opportunity for the Billionaire’s Club and activists to change public policy and obtain government grants. The Committee demonstrates how the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under President Obama’s watch has installed an audacious green-revolving door, which has become a valuable asset for the environmental movement and the Billionaire’s Club.

The common goal of this network appears to be the explosion of stringent restrictions on energy access and a reformation of the capitalist system. This goal was clearly articulated by Billionaire Club member, Nat Simons, President and Founder of Sea Change Foundation:
To get it done, quickly, is going to take a Herculean effort from all sides. Because it’s not really a question of whether we move to a low carbon economy. I think it’s clear we’re moving there… the question is how quickly. The role of philanthropy is really to facilitate that process.

While this report sheds significant light on the who and the how, the truly outrageous nature of these complex arrangements are only understood by exploring the why. This report articulates several possible reasons for the convoluted and secretive structure of the far-left environmental movement; yet, at the end of the day, we are still asking – why? Why are members of the Billionaire’s Club going to such extreme lengths to hide their generous support of supposed charitable causes?
I. Legal Framework of Far-Left Environmental Movement

The far-left environmental movement is comprised of hundreds of nonprofit organizations. Each entity is strategically set up according to its designated purpose in the funding chain. This section lays out the most prevalent forms used by a group of wealthy individuals choreographing the far-left environmental movement, namely the 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) nonprofits, as well as fiscal sponsorship arrangements available for groups who have not obtained nonprofit status from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

a. 501(c)(3) Private Foundations and Public Charities

Members of the Billionaire’s Club who want a seat at the environmental policy table have the option to fund a 501(c)(3) private foundation or public charity. Importantly, by funding a 501(c)(3), they obtain the added benefit of making contributions on a tax deductible basis. In 2010, tax deductions for charitable contributions to 501(c)(3) organizations resulted in an estimated $40 billion loss to federal revenue. While the rules for disclosing donations received by private foundations and public charities differ, both organizations are required to file an annual IRS 990-form to maintain its 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status. Moreover, both a public charity and a private foundation must disclose contributions to other entities if the amount exceeds $5,000.

In exchange for the generous tax benefits donors receive, limits exist on 501(c)(3) activities. For instance, they must not directly or indirectly participate in political campaigns. The IRS clearly articulates the restriction on political activities, advising that “501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office.” Breaching this provision may result in denial or revocation of tax-exempt status and the imposition of certain excise taxes. Further, 501(c)(3) s are limited in their ability to lobby, as they cannot devote more than an “insubstantial” (i.e. between 5 and 10%) portion of their resources to lobbying activities.

---

4 Id.
7 Id.
8 IRS, Tax Information for Charities & Other Non-Profits http://www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Lobbying Organizations may, however, involve themselves in issues of public policy without the activity being considered as lobbying. For example, organizations may conduct educational meetings, prepare and distribute educational materials, or otherwise consider public policy issues in an educational manner without jeopardizing their tax-exempt status.
i. Private Foundations

Typically, the most wealthy far-left individuals have elected to fund their own 501(c)(3) private foundation. In fact, each member of the Billionaire’s Club has a private foundation that is extremely politically motivated and holds considerable sway over the environmental community. By creating a private foundation, they can make a substantial contribution to their foundation and enjoy a sizable tax break of up to 30% of their adjusted gross income (AGI), while the foundation itself does not pay a tax on this income. Private foundations must disclose all donors on its IRS Form 990-PF, and so starting a private foundation allows the donor to associate his or her family name with the foundation’s work.

As depicted in the chart below, there are roughly a dozen prominent private foundations created by the Billionaire’s Club that have huge sums of money at their disposal to spend on environmental causes. Among this list, the Committee focused on several extremely active private foundations, including the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Schmidt Family Foundation, the Sea Change Foundation, the Park Foundation, and the Marisla Foundation.

---

16 About, THE SCHMIDT FAMILY FOUND., http://tsffoundation.org/about/ (last visited July 24, 2014). (The foundation was created by Eric Schmidt, a software engineer, who previously served as CEO of Google, where he is the current executive chairman.).
### Billionaire’s Club Private Foundations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Total Assets - 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$6,299,952,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td>$5,697,258,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz Family Foundation</td>
<td>$117,095,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisla Foundation</td>
<td>$51,482,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Foundation</td>
<td>$366,405,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Brothers Foundation</td>
<td>$800,956,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt Family Foundation</td>
<td>$46,542,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Change Foundation</td>
<td>$124,350,435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Family Foundation</td>
<td>$1,999,066,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>$7,735,371,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assets from most recent IRS Form-990-PF available (2011)

As a private foundation director/trustee, the donor can manage and invest the funds and select the eventual charitable recipient over a period of years.\(^{20}\) Private foundations also give the donor the greatest amount of discretion over how funds are distributed and used. The private foundations discussed in this report generally do not donate in an altruistic or philanthropic manner. Instead, they employ a “prescriptive grantmaking” technique wherein they seek beneficiaries whose actions and work fit the agenda of the foundation and its donors.\(^{21}\) Prescriptive grantmaking foundations impose a very tightly defined strategic plan for proposals that match the defined formula.\(^{22}\) Examples of prescriptive grantmaking by some of the Billionaire’s Club private foundations include a $50,000 grant from the Park Foundation to the New York Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) for “continuation of its widespread public education campaign on the issue of gas drilling in New York;”\(^{23}\) a $200,000 grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation to the Union of Concerned Scientists “for coal retirement and removing market barriers to renewable energy projects;”\(^{24}\) as well as a $79,690 grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to The Nature Conservancy “to support efforts to protect the wild salmon ecosystems of Alaska’s Bristol Bay region.”\(^{25}\)

### ii. Public Charities

The Billionaire’s Club also donates directly to 501(c)(3) public charities. Generally, the public charity is considered the preferred status under the tax code, based on the greater tax benefits and protections on donor disclosures. A donor’s tax deductible limit for a charitable

---


\(^{22}\) Id.

\(^{23}\) Park Found., IRS form 990, 2012.

\(^{24}\) William and Flora Hewlett Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.

\(^{25}\) Gordon and Betty Moore Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.
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donation to a public charity is much higher than a private foundation, up to 50% of their AGI.\textsuperscript{26} In order to qualify as a public charity, one-third of donations must come from relatively small donors, from other public charities, or from the government.\textsuperscript{27} For individual donors, only $5,000 of an individual donation can count towards the one-third public funding requirement.\textsuperscript{28} However, if the public charity receives a grant from the government, 100% of those funds count towards the one-third public funding requirement.\textsuperscript{29}

Unlike a private foundation, public charities are not required to disclose donors, creating an opportunity for the wealthy to make anonymous contributions to pay for ‘charitable activities.’\textsuperscript{30} Indeed, anonymity makes donating to a public charity highly attractive to donors wishing to remain unknown. According to Drummond Pike, founder of the Tides Foundation and its related nonprofit groups, “Anonymity is very important to most of the people we work with.”\textsuperscript{31}

A public charity may be characterized as a foundation or an otherwise nonprofit organization. Some of the most active public charities in the far-left environmental sphere are characterized as foundations. These include the Tides Foundation, Energy Foundation, ClimateWorks Foundation and the Sustainable Markets Foundation. Other public charities represent themselves as activists, such as the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), League of Conservation Voters (LCV), Greenpeace, Center for Biological Diversity (CBD), National Wildlife Federation (NWF), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), which act as the public face of the environmental movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Assets - 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ClimateWorks Foundation</td>
<td>$219,543,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Foundation</td>
<td>$32,212,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pew Charitable Trusts</td>
<td>$735,245,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Markets Found</td>
<td>$2,056,007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tides Foundation</td>
<td>$141,039,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Assets from most recent IRS Form-990 available (2011)

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{What is a 501(c)(3)?}, supra note 11.
\textsuperscript{28} 26 C.R.F. § 1.509(a)-3 (2012).
Public charities also attempt to provide the maximum amount of control to their donors through the creation of fiscal sponsorships. A novel innovation unique to the left is the proliferation of a fiscal sponsor relationship, whereby the charity actually sells its nonprofit status to a group for a fee. Through this arrangement, the fiscal sponsor serves as the official recipient of charitable donations for an organization unrecognized by the IRS.32 A fiscal sponsorship arrangement is usually not overly obvious, and is typically only revealed when a potential donor inquires about receiving a tax break for its donation.33 The sponsorship fees range from 5% to 14% of total revenue.34 In addition to the generous tax benefit, sponsors often provide payroll, employee benefits, office space, publicity, fundraising assistance, and training services to the sponsored organization.35 This allows donors to make tax deductible contributions to support a narrowly defined project, with the full tax benefit enjoyed by a public charity, and no donor disclosure.

The fiscal sponsor relationship is built on very shaky legal grounds. The only precedential guidance issued by the IRS came from a revenue ruling issued over 45 years ago – well before this practice began in earnest.36 Moreover, to the extent the IRS recognizes the validity of such a relationship, it should be in the context of “specific short term project[s] – such as providing assistance following a local disaster, or construction of a new playground or dog...
However, in the realm of the far-left environmental movement, fiscal sponsorship arrangements are far from temporary and usually around for several years or more. One fiscal sponsorship arrangement has existed for over 23 years, and the sponsored entity has indicated no plans to properly establish its own nonprofit status.

This report focuses on fiscal sponsors including the Tides Foundation, the Sustainable Markets Foundation and Virginia Organizing. A prominent example of a fiscal sponsor relationship is illustrated by the Sustainable Markets Foundation (SMF) sponsorship of 350.org. Started by environmental activist Bill McKibben in 2008, 350.org is based in Washington, DC and Brooklyn, New York. In a 2010 interview, McKibben referred to the state of 350.org during the preceding year as a “scruffy little outfit” with “almost no money.” Yet, Isky.org, 350.org’s precursor, reported expenses of over $2.6 million between October 1, 2008, and September 30, 2009, and net assets of over $2.1 million. By 2012, 350.org disclosed expenses of over $2.8 million and net assets of over $3 million. Between 2011 and 2014, 350.org separately collected hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Park Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, Tides Foundation, Marisla Foundation, ClimateWorks Foundation and Rockefeller Family Foundation – through grants to SMF. Accordingly, this is hardly the type of temporary fundraising relationship envisioned by the IRS when it drafted the revenue ruling.

Understanding the scope and limits of a 501(c)(3) private foundation and public charity is essential to understanding how the Billionaire’s Club and far-left environmental organizations operate, interact, and how their actions may impermissibly exceed the scope of their charitable designation.

b. The 501(c)(4)

If a member of the Billionaire’s Club wishes to sponsor political activities and engage in a more aggressive lobbying campaign, he or she can anonymously fund a 501(c)(4) organization. Importantly, when donations made to a 501(c)(4) are not disclosed and used for

37 Id.
38 Id.
40 350.org, IRS Form 990, 2012.
43 350.org, IRS Form 990, 2008.
44 350.org IRS Form 990, 2012.
45 Park Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2013.
46 Rockefeller Bros. Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2013.
47 Tides Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2013.
48 Marisla Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2013.
49 ClimateWorks Found., IRS Form 990, 2010.
50 Rockefeller Family Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2013.
political purposes, it is referred to as “dark money.” Similar to a 501(c)(3), a 501(c)(4) is not organized for profit. Donations to a 501(c)(4) are not tax deductible; however, 501(c)(4) revenue is exempt from federal income tax, as well as state franchise taxes and other expenses.

Under the tax code, a 501(c)(4) is designated as a “social welfare” organization, which means it must operate exclusively to “further the common good and general welfare of the people of the community (such as by bringing about civic betterment and social improvements).” A 501(c)(4) may engage in lobbying as its primary purpose without jeopardizing its exempt status. Non-social welfare activities, such as political activity, are permissible, though limited. The IRS permits a 501(c)(4) to dedicate up to 50% of its funds towards political activities and still maintain its beneficial tax status. Political activities are those activities conducted to influence an election, selection, nomination, or appointment of any individual to public office.

Nearly all of the public charities discussed in this report have an affiliated 501(c)(4) that engages in activities designed to influence elections and have no restrictions on their lobbying efforts. The funding of a 501(c)(4) by a 501(c)(3) affiliate is provocative in light of the restrictions the law places on public charities from participating in any political campaigning, either directly or indirectly, while permitting a 501(c)(4) to significantly engage in campaign activities. The law requires that to the extent a 501(c)(3) funds a 501(c)(4), the donated funds must be earmarked for charitable activities. The 501(c)(3) assumes financial oversight responsibilities to ensure the donation is only spent on activities the 501(c)(3) can undertake.

While the law requires a clear separation between the activities of the 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4), evidence suggests that in numerous instances, a 501(c)(3) and an affiliated 501(c)(4) share the same space, staff and board members. According to attorneys in the nonprofit field,

---

59 Internal Revenue Code, 26 USC 501(c)(3) - “absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office”
60 Schadler, supra note 56, at 41.
61 Schadler, supra note 56, at 41.
62 Schadler, supra note 56, at 36.
63 Lobbying & 501(c)(4) Primer, supra note 54.
“[a]s a practical matter, many smaller and medium sized organizations utilizing this combined structure try to limit the use of the 501(c)(4) in terms of revenues, staff time, and expenses. This allows organizations to take greatest advantage of favorable 501(c)(3) charitable contribution deductions, sales tax exemptions, and postal rates.”64 Because all money is fungible, it appears that some money funneled through a 501(c)(3), benefitting from favorable tax treatment, could indirectly support political activities carried on by a 501(c)(4).

While the critical 2010 Citizens United ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court struck down restrictions on nonprofits’ spending of general treasury funds for independent public communications that “expressly advocate” for a federal candidate and “electioneering communications,”65 the Court’s decision did not affect the IRS limits on 501(c)(4) political activities.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Nonprofit Tax-Exempt Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501c3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations tax deductible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more than 10% of resources for lobbying activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited from engaging, directly or indirectly, in political activities except for nonpartisan voter education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can donate to 501c3 and 501c4 groups with limits (only for c3 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must disclose donations exceeding $5,000 on Form 990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Charities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required to publically disclose donors on annual IRS Form 990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 of donations must come from public (only $5,000 of donation counts towards 1/3 requirement); 100% of government grants count towards that requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor tax break up to 50% of adjusted gross income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 Id.
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II. The Billionaire’s Club: Leveraging their Investment

When a member of the Billionaire’s Club donates to a 501(c)(3), that transaction must be disclosed on the IRS Form-990. Accordingly, the Committee conducted a meticulous review of these public filings to follow the money. That money trail starts with a select group of the most active environmental foundations, flows through intermediary public charities referred to as pass-throughs and fiscal sponsors, and ends up within the coffers of activist groups who enact the proscribed agenda. A close knit network deeply entrenched in the far-left environmental movement facilitate the whole process. This section reveals this network and explains the role grant receiving activists play.

a. The Ties that Bind: Key Relationships Between Facilitators, Donors, and Activists

Members of the Billionaire’s Club put a premium on access to the complex environmental infrastructure that has evolved to leverage substantial assets towards achieving defined policy outcomes. The Billionaire’s Club needs this infrastructure to execute a centralized political strategy, and obtain a return on their investment. As a result, several models have developed to respond to this specific demand. One of the central planners of environmental strategy is the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA), but they are not the only force out there. The Democracy Alliance executes a complimentary but larger-scaled effort to funnel foundation funds into far-left political outcomes, which encompasses the same desired environmental policies as EGA. Finally, the Divest/Invest movement employs moral sentiments to pressure like-minded foundations to divest from fossil fuels, and invest in charity or renewable projects. Each of these groups has directed foundation dollars towards a specific and coordinated political agenda, which is then executed by environmental activists and so-called grassroots organizers.

i. Environmental Grantmakers Association: Where the Liberal Elite Meet and Mingle

According to its website, EGA has nearly 200 members and “works with members and partners to promote effective environmental philanthropy by sharing knowledge, fostering debate, cultivating leadership, facilitating collaboration, and catalyzing action.” In 2011, EGA member organizations collectively donated approximately $1.13 billion, or 40% of all foundation giving, to environmental causes. EGA is a very secretive organization, withholding its membership list from the public. In fact, in response to a request from the Committee, EGA even refused to disclose their membership list to Congress.
According to Ron Arnold, a prolific author who has written extensively on how the far-left environmental funders operate, distribute money, and influence policy, he argues that the EGA is “command central of the environmental movement.”70 By deciding which organizations get money, the grantmakers “drive[ing] their own agenda with selective grants.”71 A transcript of an early EGA 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 grass roots component organizing component from yet a third group with a structure that enables them to function well.72

For institutions adopting prescriptive grantmaking “the motto is, don’t show up without an invitation.”73 The Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) is a good example of prescriptive grantmaking used to drive an identified agenda. RBF warn prospective applicants that: “While the Fund remains open to unsolicited requests, applicants should be aware that the likelihood of an unsolicited request becoming a grant is low.”74

The RBF is by no means the only foundation who refuses to consider uninvited applicants. The Schmidt Family Foundation also warns prospective grant applicants that, “all of the Foundation's grantmaking is now done on a strictly invitational basis and we will not review proposals received either in the mail or to our email inbox. We proactively seek new partnerships based on our program area strategies.”75 Similarly the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation bluntly states:

Almost all grants are awarded to organizations identified by the Foundation. The Foundation does accept unsolicited Letters of Inquiry from organizations looking for funding in limited areas. Only on very rare occasions are grants awarded in response to these unsolicited funding inquiries.76

---
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The prescriptive grants awarded by EGA members specify how recipients must use the funds. This allows the Billionaire’s Club to engage in a defined transaction so they know in advance what services to expect for their money. As such, environmental groups that heavily rely on foundation funds to comprise a substantial portion of their budgets begin to look much more like private contractors buying and selling a service rather than benevolent nonprofits seeking to carry out charitable acts.

Top 10 EGA Donors to Environmental Causes in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Total Dollars Awarded</th>
<th>No. of Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td>$134,438,760</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David and Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>$121,016,258</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Family Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$76,218,045</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>$53,439,469</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>$43,809,793</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Change Foundation</td>
<td>$43,149,911</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard King Mellon Foundation</td>
<td>$29,080,000</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Foundation</td>
<td>$28,507,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>$24,204,500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>$23,922,840</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$577,786,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ii. Democracy Alliance: Advancing the Progressive Agenda by Promoting the Far-Left Environmental Agenda**

The EGA is unquestionably the funding epicenter of the environmental movement; however, other groups have emerged to augment their efforts. The Democracy Alliance (DA) adopted many of the lessons learned by EGA and works to create an all-encompassing far-left infrastructure to support affiliated and approved groups. According to DA, it connects wealthy donors, other similarly minded donors, “high impact organizations,” and political leaders. In fact, DA boasts that it is the “largest convener of progressive individuals and institutional donors” and serves as a “center of gravity” for the far-left funding world.

Members of DA pay $30,000 in dues and pledge to contribute at least $200,000 to groups DA supports. In exchange, DA gives clients “professional recommendations” on progressive philanthropy, as well as “invitations to exclusive events and conference calls, regular communications, such as updates on important issues and the work of recommended organizations and quarterly newsletters and access to [a] members-only community website and comprehensive Partner Directory.”

---

78 Memo from Stephanie Mueller to DA Board of Directors RE: DA Spring Conference Messaging Q and A, April 22, 2014
In a spring 2014 publication, DA claims to make investment recommendations to wealthy donors to advance and protect the interests of “lower and middle-income Americans” in the political system.\(^{81}\) Yet, in doing so, this group caters to millionaires and billionaires, while ironically suggesting the “flood of special interest money in our political system continues unabated” without acknowledging the hypocrisy in its efforts to funnel money to activists groups attacking affordable energy, and undermining the very people they claim to protect.\(^ {82}\)

Further, DA flouts transparency and public participation as the group emphasizes secrecy in all its operations. It does not disclose the details of any transaction it facilitates, and its members and donor-recipients cannot speak publically about the organization.\(^ {83}\) While DA does not disclose transactions it facilitates, it is likely not a coincidence that two groups highlighted in its 2014 publication - the Center for American Progress (CAP) and Media Matters - received vast sums of money from the same foundations supporting the far-left environmental movement. CAP is an organization dedicated to increasing government control. It was co-founded by John Podesta, the current senior climate advisor to President Obama and former President Bill Clinton’s Chief of Staff, along with Herbert Sandler, who recently contributed $1 million to Tom Steyer’s NextGen Climate Action Committee.\(^ {84}\) Notably, Sandler is the Founding Chairman of far-left media outlet ProPublica, and currently serves on its Board of Directors with Steyer’s wife, Kat Taylor.\(^ {85}\)

Between 2010 and 2013, Sea Change Foundation, Wallace Global Fund, Energy Foundation, Rockefeller Family Fund, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Tides Foundation, and the Marisla Foundation donated over $7 million to CAP.\(^ {86}\) Notably, in 2009, a Bermuda-based group, The Atlantic Philanthropies, gave CAP a $500,000 grant, “To support a joint project with Media Matters Action Network.”\(^ {87}\) Media Matters is a clearly liberal media group that advertises itself as “dedicated to comprehensively monitoring, analyzing, and correcting...”

\begin{quote}
Many of our donors choose not to participate publicly, and we respect that. The DA exists to provide a comfortable environment for our partners to collectively make a real impact.
-Democracy Alliance Board of Directors
\end{quote}

---


\(^{82}\) Id.


\(^{85}\) http://www.propublica.org/about/leadership/


\(^{87}\) Atlantic Philanthropies, IRS Form 990, 2009.
One of DA’s “progressive victories” included “a series of executive actions to combat the threat of climate change…made possible by a well-aligned network of organizations – collaborating with the greater progressive infrastructure – that drives change by …communicating policies to key constituencies.”

-Spring 2014 Democracy Alliance Investment Recommendations

conservative misinformation in the U.S. media.”

Members of the Billionaire’s Club, including Wallace Global Fund, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Park Foundation, Tides Foundation and Marisla Foundations, have donated over $1.8 million to Media Matters between 2010 and 2013. David Brock founded Media Matters in 2004 and currently serves as the group’s president as well as president of the far-left media outlet, The American Independent Institute. Brock also sits on the board of Priorities USA, another group DA steers money towards.

In addition to groups such as CAP and Media Matters, DA created a progressive infrastructure map including several environmental groups discussed in this report. Many of the groups recommended to the ‘investors’ and “vetted by Investment Services Staff” lead the environmental movement and are already heavily funded by EGA members. For instance, DA seeks to steer money towards 350.org, BlueGreen Alliance, the League of Conservation Voters (LCV), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Sierra Club, and U.S. Public Interest Research Groups (PIRGs).

These environmental groups are well aligned with the greater far-left agenda. Indeed, one of DA’s “progressive victories” included “a series of executive actions to combat the threat of climate change…made possible by a well-aligned network of organizations – collaborating with the greater progressive infrastructure – that drives change by …communicating policies to key constituencies.”

---
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iii. Divest/Invest: The Moral Crusaders

The divesting in fossil fuels and investing in philanthropy (Divest/Invest) movement follows a slightly different model, but involves many of the same players. Essentially, Divest/Invest defines the fossil fuel industry as a moral pariah. This group attempts to evoke the moral stance associated with the anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa in the 1980’s and depicts the effort to divest in fossil fuel as a moral imperative. In doing so, this group opposes a tool that would help to secure the goal of economic opportunity for Africans that Mandela fought for.

Originally, Bill McKibben, the founder and President of 350.org started the movement through the 2013 “Do the Math” tour. According to an article in Rolling Stone magazine, McKibben further argued that foundations should divest from fossil fuels because the industry's business plan to market its existing reserves contradicts the far-left efforts on climate change. Moreover, he urged that these funds go towards “climate solutions” and so-called renewable projects. The goal of these efforts has been clearly articulated by Nat Simons, President of Sea Change Foundation:

To get it done, quickly, is going to take a Herculean effort from all sides. Because it’s not really a question of whether we move to a low carbon economy. I think it’s clear we’re moving there…the question is how quickly. The role of philanthropy is really to facilitate that process... It’s not going to be ramming something down the throats of certain people. We know that that’s not going to work. We’ve seen that, we’ve watched that movie before. We know it’s not going to happen. We can’t take this momentum and let it stall. So philanthropists, foundations, they have a huge responsibility.

Following McKibben’s efforts, in January 2014, Dr. Ellen Dorsey, Executive Director of the Wallace Global Fund, launched the initiative, Divest-Invest Philanthropy. She previously worked with the Heinz endowments and sat on the board of Amnesty International. The Wallace Family Fund has given to many environmental groups highlighted in this report, including 350.org, Sustainable Markets Foundation, Center for American Progress, Center for Biological Diversity, Union of Concerned Scientists, the Tides Center, Sierra Club, Virginia

---
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\subsection*{b. The Facilitators: Key Environmental Activists}

Just as the Environmental Grantmakers Association, Democracy Alliance, and others have forged close relationships in order to attract attention of investors, so too have individuals. The Committee has discovered a narrow set of individuals whose careers are part of the fabric of the far-left environmental movement. These individuals exercise outsized influence regarding the distribution of funds. Some of these individuals include: Donald Ross, Hal Harvey, Mark Burget, Charlotte Pera, Larry Kramer, William Reilly, and Jay Halfon. Each individual has long employment histories at private foundations, public charities and activist groups at the forefront of the far-left environmental movement. Today, they serve as coordinators and intermediaries between the private foundations and the activist groups.


Hal Harvey connects the Hewlett Foundation, the Energy Foundation and the ClimateWorks Foundation. He currently serves as CEO of Energy Innovation, an energy and environmental policy firm, and most recently assisted in the public release of the highly criticized\footnote{Risky Business Project, Understanding Climate Risk with Hal Harvey, http://riskybusiness.org/report/overview/understanding-risk (last visited July 28, 2014).} Risky Business Project, co-Chaired by Henry Paulson, Michael Bloomberg, and
Tom Steyer. Paulson is a former Secretary of the Treasury and current Chairman of the Paulson Institute, which advocates for environmental protection in the United States and China. Michael Bloomberg is founder of Bloomberg LP and served three terms as Mayor of New York City. The main sponsors of the project were Bloomberg Philanthropies, the Office of Hank Paulson, the Rockefeller Family Fund and the TomKat Charitable Trust. Harvey’s relationship with Paulson dates back at least to May 2012, when Harvey served as a Senior Fellow at the Paulson Institute, though it likely goes back much further as Wendy Paulson, Hank Paulson’s wife, is active in the environmental sphere as she served on the board of The Nature Conservancy (TNC).

Before his collaborative project with Paulson, Bloomberg and Steyer, Harvey was founder and CEO of ClimateWorks Foundation from 2008 to 2011, and served as the founder and President of the Energy Foundation from 1991 to 2002. From January 2002 through January 2008, he was the Environment Program Director of the Hewlett Foundation. Harvey’s successor at ClimateWorks was Mark Burget, the former Chief Conservation Programs Officer at TNC. Burget has since returned to TNC as the Executive Vice President and North American Regional Director, and also currently serves on the Board of Directors at the Energy Foundation. Burget was replaced by Charlotte Pera, who was formerly the Senior Vice President and Director of US Programs at the Energy Foundation. Larry Kramer is also connected to this network as the current president of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, as well as serving on the board of ClimateWorks Foundation.

President Obama and William Reilly

---

William Reilly is another person with close connections to these individuals and organizations. Before his appointment to serve as EPA Administrator in 1989, Reilly was the President of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). He returned to WWF in 1993 after his tenure at EPA, and is currently Chairman Emeritus of the Board of WWF. He is also Chairman Emeritus of the Board of ClimateWorks Foundation, director of the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, and is on the Advisory Board of the Nicholas Institute for Environment Policy Solutions at Duke University.  

Jay Halfon is another pivotal player that has emerged in the environmental movement through his connections in New York. Halfon is currently on the Board of Directors for the Park Foundation, Earthworks, Sustainable Markets Foundation (SMF), and 350.org. Interestingly, Halfon does not even list his affiliation to SMF on his 350.org biography; yet Park Foundation heavily funds SMF and SMF is a “fiscal sponsor” of 350.org. Notably, the President of 350.org, Bill McKibben, is a close friend of Tom Steyer. In 2012, McKibben and Steyer hiked through the Adirondack Mountains, where the two men bonded and McKibben encouraged Steyer to become active in environmental causes, including opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline.

Previously, Halfon served as Executive Director of Donald Ross’s NY-PIRG. PIRGs play a central role in the environmental movement as a meeting ground for trial attorneys and radical activists to coordinate a faux grassroots campaign. SMF has close ties to PIRGs and provides significant funding to PIRG chapters. Including Halfon, three of the four officers of the SMF previously worked for PIRG: the President of SMF, Elizabeth Hitchcock, served as Communications Director for US PIRGs, and Secretary and Treasurer of SMF, Geoff Boehm, was Program Director and Senior Attorney for NY-PIRG.

---
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c. The Face of the Environmental Movement: Public Charity Activists

The ultimate recipients of donations from the Billionaire’s Club include far-left environmental public charities. While a willing and knowledgeable partner to the Billionaire’s Club, these entities propagate the false notion that they are independent, citizen-funded groups working altruistically. In reality, they work in tandem with wealthy donors to maximize the value of the donors’ tax deductible donations and leverage their combined resources to influence elections and policy outcomes, with a focus on the EPA.

Primarily, the public charity serves as the face of the environmental movement. For example, the National Resourced Defense Council (NRDC) brags that: “We work with those who would help us move to a sustainable future and we sue those who poison our people or lands.”

The Union of Concerned (UCS) claims it “stands out among nonprofit organizations as the reliable source for independent scientific analysis.”

The iconic panda logo has made the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) instantly recognizable to many people around the world, and boasts the noble goal of working to preserve nature and its creatures.

World Wildlife Fund Headquarters – Ziest, Netherlands

The notion that far-left environmental charities fight for the interest of the common man is encapsulated in a video promoted by 350.org. This video, which articulates their fight against capitalism, argues that the “extractive economy,” harms both the environment and the common

---

“The new economy has to step away, and then push back at those old pillars, because it has to be a new economy that is about sustainable resources, that puts people before profit, that puts planet before profit.”

-350.org-supported video

Far from their propaganda, these activist groups merely provide a service to wealthy “investors,” who pay a sizable sum for specialized services. The chart below provides additional detail about the amount of funding these groups have received from the Billionaire’s Club.

### Billionaire’s Club Funding to Key Environmental Activists (2010-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Grants Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association</td>
<td>$4,816,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlueGreen Alliance</td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for American Progress</td>
<td>$8,390,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthjustice</td>
<td>$3,533,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Defense Fund</td>
<td>$53,695,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Integrity Project</td>
<td>$2,098,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>$1,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters Education Fund</td>
<td>$13,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Audubon Society</td>
<td>$11,192,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>$14,490,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
<td>$25,512,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>$58,633,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club Foundation</td>
<td>$17,263,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Concerned Scientists</td>
<td>$8,195,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
<td>$26,614,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Federal agencies, which wield significant amounts of delegated power, should be staffed with neutral experts dedicated to serving the public interest. However, recent reports of alleged collusion between environmentalists and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) senior officials have made apparent the Obama Administration’s failure to abide by this most basic principle of executive branch governance. In fact, the Committee has uncovered evidence that proves President Obama and his EPA are pivotal partners in the far-left environmental movement. The Agency’s leadership under President Obama is closely connected with the Billionaire’s Club and their network of activists. These connections provide the Billionaire’s Club with the opportunity to exploit the relationships, and in turn shape public policy and the disposition of government grants. This section reveals that as part of the far-left scheme, the Obama Administration has installed an audacious green-revolving door at EPA, which has become a valuable asset for the environmental movement and its wealthy donors.

a. EPA’s Green Revolving Door

The Committee has obtained emails that amply demonstrate how the environmental movement is deeply plugged into the Obama EPA via operatives who rotate through the Administration. In one shocking example, the Committee learned of an arrangement between the Rockefeller Family Fund (RFF) and EPA where RFF agreed to pay the salary of Shalini Vajjhala, then an employee at the nonprofit organization Resources for the Future, to work at the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). According to internal EPA documents, this arrangement benefited EPA as Vajjhala would have the opportunity to, “stake our claim there” – where “our” is the EPA Office of International and Tribal Affairs and “there” refers to the White House.

This arrangement was enthusiastically endorsed by both former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson, stating “I think it’s a fine idea and can only help EPA in the long run,” and Jackson’s Chief of Staff Diane Thompson, affirming “My thoughts exactly. The more inside connections the better” (emphasis added). After Vajjhala cycled through the White House and EPA, she returned to the Rockefeller Family Fund and is now founder and CEO of E.invest Initiative, whose portfolio is supported by the Rockefeller funding. Interestingly, Vajjhala is also a contributor to the Huffington Post, which is heavily funded by the Park Foundation.

In another outrageous email exchange, former Assistant Administrator for the Office of International and Tribal Affairs, Michelle DePass, and “Richard Windsor,” former Administrator Jackson’s alias, strategize over how best to leverage a public appearance before the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA). Reproduced in full, the email exchange states:

138 Email from Shalini Vajjhala to Michelle DePass (June 19, 2009; 07:27 AM EST)(On file with Committee)
139 Email from Michelle DePass to Richard Windsor (June 19, 2009)(On file with Committee).
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In this exchange, top level EPA leadership planned how to use DePass’s position on the Board of Directors of EGA, her imminent employment at EPA, and her relationship with Administrator Jackson, to enhance her leverage with EGA. Jackson supported the plan, despite the ease with which DePass could have withdrawn from sponsoring the event to eliminate the conflict of interest. Notably, other sponsors of the event included Jessica Bailey and Michael Northop from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, as well as Eric Heitz and Charlotte Pera from the Energy Foundation.\(^\text{144}\) The Committee uncovered another instance where DePass was taking advantage of her EPA appointment to benefit her environmental colleagues. Specifically, in May 2009 – after her nomination to EPA was announced – DePass emailed Jackson asking her to “do a drive-by” at a Grist event.\(^\text{145}\) At the time, DePass was a Grist board member\(^\text{146}\) and noted “It is my last Grist function as a board member….but this will be fun… I invited the CEQ posse

\(^\text{144}\) Email from Rob Sargent to Michelle DePass (January 26, 2009; 01:53PM EST)(on file with Committee)

\(^\text{145}\) Email from Michelle DePass to Richard Windsor (May 27, 2009; 05:05 PM EST) (on file with Committee).

too.” These email exchanges confirm the close relationships between the foundations, environmental activist groups and the Obama Administration.

A review of senior Obama EPA officials also demonstrates that the Agency values and seeks out individuals with ties to large environmental groups for key leadership positions. The groups cultivating the most EPA staff mirror the groups garnering the lion’s share of donations from the Billionaire’s Club. These groups include the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), Public Interest Research Groups (PIRGs), Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) and Center for American Progress (CAP).

Indeed, the NRDC staff absorbed by the Obama Administration and Capitol Hill Democrats in 2009 was referred to as the “NRDC mafia” because they occupied so many key positions throughout the democratically controlled government. While at EPA, these officials were able to advance their activist agenda, this time with full support of the government.

Former activists have held or are currently holding senior positions throughout the Agency – in its Washington D.C. headquarters and in its ten regional offices across the country. The revolving door includes activists from private foundations as well as public charities. These officials include:

- Bob Perciasepe – Deputy Administrator of the EPA. He was the former Chief Operating Officer of the National Audubon Society. He recently announced his impending departure from the Agency to become President of the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, formerly the Pew Center for Climate Solutions. Watchdog groups uncovered evidence that Perciasepe used his personal email to communicate with environmentalists in violation of EPA policy.

- Nancy Stoner – Acting Administrator/Deputy Administrator for the Office of Water. She served as the Co-Director and Senior Attorney for the NRDC’s Water Program from 1999 until 2010. In her capacity at the Office of Water at EPA, she was accused of sharing livestock operators’ personal information with environmental groups, including NRDC.

- Judith Enck – Region 2 Administrator. She was previously Senior Environmental Associate at NY-PIRG, Executive Director of the Environmental Advocates of New York, and President of Hudson River Sloop Clearwater. Enck has been accused of several inappropriate and unethical actions, which this report discusses in detail.
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Watchdog groups also uncovered Enck using her personal email to communicate with environmentalists in violation of EPA policy.  

- Jared Blumenfeld – Region 9 Administrator. He was formerly employed by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund as well as the NRDC. He was recently caught lying to the EPA’s Office of Inspector General about using his personal email account for work purposes, in violation of EPA policy.

- Joseph Goffman – Associate Assistant Administrator and Senior Counsel for the Office of Air and Radiation. He is the chief architect of EPA’s proposed Existing Source Performance Standards for existing power plants, which has been criticized as relying too heavily on a draft produced by the NRDC. Goffman previously held a senior policy position at Environmental Defense (formerly of EDF). He also served on the Board of Directors for the Environmental Resources Trust, a nonprofit organization he and two colleagues founded with the help of EDF.

- Francesca Grifo – Scientific Integrity Official. She previously served as senior scientist and director of the UCS, where she was heavily criticized for her lack of scientific integrity. In her current role, she has failed to provide competent responses to the Committee related to instances of scientific misconduct at the EPA.

- Matthew Tejada – Director of the Office of Environmental Justice. He previously worked for TX-PIRG and led Air Alliance Houston, an activist organization focusing specifically on environmental justice issues, for over five years. Air Alliance of
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Houston publically partners with EDF, NRDC, Sierra Club, and Public Citizen, among other far-left environmental organizations.\footnote{Our Partners, AIR ALLIANCE OF HOUSTON, http://airalliancehouston.org/content/our-partners (last visited July 25, 2014).} He was brought to the attention of former EPA Region 6 Administrator Al Armendariz in March 2010 by Elena Craft, of EDF.\footnote{Email from Elena Craft to Al Armendariz (Mar. 1, 2010; 12:03 PM EST) (on file with Committee).} Ironically, at the time he was appointed to the EPA, he was actually suing EPA, along with other environmental activists on the basis of environmental justice concerns.\footnote{Ron Arnold, Meet the little nobody from Texas with big power at EPA, WASHINGTON EXAMINER, June 13, 2013, http://washingtonexaminer.com/ron-arnold-meet-the-little-nobody-from-texas-with-big-power-at-epa/article/2531854.}

Many former Obama EPA officials also worked with the far-left environmental movement and the Billionaire’s Club. Today, many of them work for their former employer or elsewhere in the environmental movement.

- Bob Sussman served as Senior Policy Counsel at EPA under Administrator Jackson. He was a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress (CAP) before he was tapped to co-chair the EPA Transition Team in 2008.\footnote{Georgetown University Law Center, Profile of Robert M. Sussman, https://www.law.georgetown.edu/faculty/sussman-robert-m.cfm (last visited July 28, 2014).} The Committee has obtained documents which demonstrates he vetted potential EPA employees based on whether they, “had the support of environmental justice leaders,” and their connections to environmental groups, like the NRDC.\footnote{Email from Macon Cowles to Bob Sussman (Feb. 13, 2009; 01:25 pm EST)(on file with Committee).} Watchdog groups also uncovered Sussman using his personal email to communicate with environmentalists in violation of EPA policy.

- Michelle DePass was the former Assistant Administrator for the Office of International and Tribal Affairs. Prior to her appointment at EPA, she worked for the Ford Foundation as an Environment and Community Development Program Officer and served on the Board of the EGA. For a period of time between her confirmation by the U.S. Senate and official start date at EPA, she continued her role at the Ford Foundation, effectively operating as an employee of both EPA and the private organization simultaneously.\footnote{Letter from Hon. David Vitter, Ranking Member, S. Comm. on Env’t & Public Works, and Hon. Darrell Issa, Chair of the H. Comm. On Oversight & Gov’t Reform, to Michelle DePass, U.S. Envt’l Prot. Agency (May. 15, 2013) (on file with Committee).} DePass resigned her position shortly after being held accountable by the Committee.\footnote{Letter from Hon. Arvin Ganisan, Assoc. Admin., U.S. Envt’l Prot. Agency, to Hon. David Vitter, Ranking Member, S. Comm. on Env’t & Public Works (June 5, 2013).}

- Dr. Al Armendariz was the Region 6 Administrator from 2009 to 2012. Prior to his appointment to EPA, he worked for the Environmental Integrity Project (EIP) and was a consultant serving as an expert witness for the Sierra Club.\footnote{Juliet Eilperin and Lisa Rein, EPA official who compared enforcement to crucifixion resigns, WASHINGTON POST, Apr. 30, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/epa-official-who-compared-enforcement-to-crucifixion-resigns/2012/04/30/glQAucsi5T_story.html.} Soon after assuming his position at EPA he sought out and hired two environmental advocates he had previously

\footnote{Tejada worked as the Executive Director of Air Alliance Houston for five years and five months. See Matthew Tejada’s Profile, LINKEDIN, http://www.linkedin.com/pub/matthew-tejada/3/959/1b4 (last accessed July 24, 2014).}
worked with at EIP – Chrissy Mann and Layla Mansuri. Mann was an attorney at EIP who later served as Armendariz’s special assistant at EPA; and Mansuri served as EPA’s Region 6 Associate Administrator previously worked for Public Citizen, EDF, and EIP. Both Mann and Mansuri had actively litigated against the Houston, Texas, petroleum coke fueled power plant, Las Brisas Energy Center (LBEC), while Armendariz prepared testimony against LBEC. While at EPA, they collectively worked on denying LBEC’s permit. The Committee released a recording in 2012 revealing Armendariz stating how he would “crucify” an energy company to set an example for the rest of the oil and gas industry. He was scheduled to testify before Congress about his controversial statement, but he skipped the Congressional hearing in favor of an interview with the Sierra Club. Soon thereafter, he resigned from EPA and is now Senior Campaign Representative for Sierra Club’s Beyond Coal Campaign.

- James Martin was the former Region 8 Administrator for EPA. Earlier in his career he was a senior attorney at EDF. He resigned his position at EPA after it became public he was using his personal email account to communicate with environmentalists, including Vicki Patton of EDF, about official agency business in violation of official EPA policy.

- Michael Goo was the former Associate Administrator of EPA. He was the legislative director for NRDC before he worked for then-Congressman Ed Markey (D-MA). While at EPA, he frequently met environmental groups at a coffee shop near EPA headquarters. Among the individuals he met with were John Coequyt, head of Sierra Club’s “Beyond Coal” campaign and Lena Moffitt, who worked for Sierra’s “Beyond Oil” campaign. Based on a series of emails between the parties, it appears they were discussing strategies to defeat the Keystone XL pipeline and the permitting of coal fired power plants.

172 Id.
179 Roberts, supra note 177.
• Robert Brenner was the former Deputy Assistant Administrator to Gina McCarthy in the Office of Air and Radiation. Soon after the EPA Office of Inspector General (EPA OIG) targeted Brenner for accepting illegal gifts he promptly retired from the Agency. He was also a central figure in the embarrassing saga of John Beale, the fake CIA Agent employed by the EPA. Brenner left EPA to join Duke University’s Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions. He is also on the Board of Directors for the Center for Clean Air Policy, along with another former EPA official, David Hawkins, who is currently at NRDC.

b. The Obama EPA Helps to Fund the Far-Left Environmental Groups

In addition to providing insider access to important policy decisions, it appears activists now at EPA also funnel government money through grants to their former employers and colleagues. The Committee’s research demonstrates that oftentimes EPA contributes to the bottom line of green groups through grants. Accordingly, a grant from EPA or another government agency is particularly valuable to a 501(c)(3) as nonprofits are required to obtain one-third of its funding from the public to maintain its tax-exempt status. A grant from EPA contributes to that goal, without limitation.

Over the last ten years EPA has awarded nearly $3 billion in grants to nonprofit organizations. Based on a Committee review of the EPA grants database, the Obama EPA has given more than $27 million in taxpayer funded grants to major environmental groups. Notably, NRDC and EDF - two key activists groups with significant ties to senior EPA officials – have collected more than $1 million in funding each.

### EPA’s Top Five Environmental Nonprofit Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
<th>2009-2014 Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$13,970,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,099,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,877,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$64,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$10,700,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,713,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An (*) denotes inclusion of grants to state or regional chapters.

The American Lung Association (ALA) receives the most Obama-EPA grants among environmental groups the Committee reviewed, totaling nearly $14 million since 2009. Over the
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last ten years, ALA has racked in $20,405,655 in EPA grants.186 Yet, ALA has been a main litigant against EPA, frequently suing the Agency only to reach a cozy settlement agreement while taxpayers foot the bill for ALA’s legal fees.187 Moreover, since federal agencies are forbidden from lobbying, one scholar suggests that ALA acts as a surrogate to lobby for the EPA in exchange for generous grants, stating:

To survive, if not thrive, the ALA needed a source of revenue. The solution: selling its reputation as an organization only interested in promoting and protecting ‘the public interest’ to government agencies and commercial firms. By lobbying and engaging in political advocacy under the halo of ‘charity,’ the ALA sought to revive its fortunes.188

Mainstream environmental groups are not the only ones to benefit from EPA grants. The Obama EPA gives grants to regional and less-well-known extreme groups, especially those operating within the environmental network described in this report. For example, the Louisiana Bucket Brigade (LABB) is an environmental activist group not only connected to the environmental network, but also has close ties to the EPA. Formerly a project of the Tides Foundation, LABB received over $400,000 in funding from the Marisla Foundation between 2011 and 2012.189 Further, LABB received significant funding from EPA under former Administrator Lisa Jackson. Jackson grew up in a New Orleans, Louisiana neighborhood and has close ties to the state.190

Most of LABB’s efforts focus on attacking oil and petrochemical refineries through “citizen science” efforts primarily funded by the EPA. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality brought a series of concerns to EPA headquarters and Region 6, detailing how LABB’s activities are not based on “sound science and legally defensible facts.”191 Even so, EPA continued to award LABB grants. From 2010 to 2012, EPA awarded LABB $194,500 in grants.192 For fiscal year 2011, EPA’s $100,000 grant on June 11, 2012, constituted more than 80% of LABB’s government funding and almost half of the group’s one-third public funding requirement.193

191 Letter from Peggy M. Hatch, Secretary, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, to Lisa Jackson, Administrator, US Environmental Protection Agency (Oct. 26, 2012).
193 Louisiana Bucket Brigade, IRS Form 990, 2011.
c. Questionable Behavior by Regional Administrator Judith Enck

Region 2 Administrator Judith Enck appears to be inappropriately and personally involved in the allocation of EPA grants. Such involvement runs afoul of the Standards of Ethical Conduct, which require all EPA employees to act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization. The Committee received reports of two separate instances where Enck gave EPA grantees special treatment.

In one case, Administrator Enck required a subordinate to search for grants that could benefit an activist group, El Puente. Allegedly, El Puente violated the terms of an EPA award, but Enck intervened on the group’s behalf, delaying termination of the grant by ten months. Both the RFF and Tides Foundation provided grants to El Puente over the same period of time Enck advocated for EPA grants to the group. The Committee also has proof Enck attended meetings between El Puente and representatives from the RFF.

Moreover, the Committee received evidence that Enck used her position to improperly funnel federal grants to environmental groups, with whom she has a personal connection. Between August 2010 and September 2012, the Hudson River Sloop Clearwater, Inc. received a series of grants from Region 2. Before Enck joined EPA, she was the president of Hudson River Sloop Clearwater. Since Enck assumed her position as Region 2 Administrator in 2009, the organization has received four EPA grants totaling $159,342. These grants are listed in the chart below.

![JUDITH ENCK’S INVOLVEMENT WITH EL PUENTE](chart)

- March 2012: Enck meets with El Puente and Rockefeller Family Fund (RFF)
- 2012: Tides gives El Puente $7,000 grant
- 2012: RFF gives El Puente $45,000 grant
- August 2012: EPA awards $25,000 grant to El Puente
- Sept. 2012: Enck meets with El Puente and RFF
- Jan. 2013: Letter from EPA notifying El Puente of failure to comply with disclosure requirements and possibility EPA may “terminate assistance”
- March 2013: El Puente cites conversation with Enck and requests an extension to comply with disclosure requirements
- Aug. 2013: Second letter from EPA to El Puente regarding its failure to follow disclosure requirements
- Nov. 2013: EPA finally terminates grant

---

195 Email from Anhthu Hoang to Paula Zevin, Apr. 27, 2012: 2:41 P.M. (on file with the Committee)
196 Letter from Roch Baamonde, Chief Grants and Audit Management Branch, to Frances Lucerna, Nov. 26, 2013 (on file with the Committee)
197 [A] Rockefeller Family Fund, IRS Form 990, 2012
This highly questionable behavior demonstrates how an EPA official with inappropriate ties to far-left groups and their foundations can use her position to benefit the environmental movement at the expense of taxpayers. In fact, the EPA OIG has confirmed that Enck is the subject of an OIG inquiry.\textsuperscript{199} Moreover, in its May 13, 2014, Summary of Closed Employee Integrity Cases, the EPA OIG revealed two other cases regarding ethical concerns with senior EPA officials.\textsuperscript{200} One case involved a Presidential appointee violating their ethics pledge on 13 occasions by communicating and/or meeting with two prohibited organizations regarding their EPA work.\textsuperscript{201} Another case involved a political appointee who on two occasions violated the rules of ethics for federal employees by accepting a gift of travel and a flight in a private jet from a registered lobbyist.\textsuperscript{202}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Purpose:} & \textbf{Awarded:} & \textbf{Amount:} \\
\hline
Environmental Justice & 08/31/2010 & $25,000 \\
Superfund & 12/14/2010 & $50,000 \\
Water & 08/03/2012 & $59,855 \\
Environmental Justice & 09/17/2012 & $24,487 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{200} http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2014/OI-Summary_of_Closed_Employee_Integrity_Cases_3-31-14.pdf
\textsuperscript{201} Id.
\textsuperscript{202} Id.
IV. Billionaire’s Club in Action: Case Studies of Services Rendered

Far-left environmental activists, while benefiting from nonprofit status, essentially sell a product to wealthy foundations who are seeking to drive policy and political outcomes. That transaction is driven by a close knit network of activists and funders who strategically channel their money into supported organizations. The Committee has found that some of the most valued services these activists provide the Billionaire’s Club includes 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 shady foreign funding.

a. Activists Groups Provide Billionaire’s Club with Propaganda

This section documents how the Billionaire’s Club both finances the creation of “science” and other studies, then pays nonprofits specialized in media relations to report on the “discovery.” Foundations often finance research that bolsters their desired policy outcome. Subsequently, another outlet they also fund will “report” on the new study and other affiliated “news outlets” will also report on it, in an effort to increase visibility. One could easily be fooled into believing that the study was independent and disinterested, covered by unbiased media outlets. However, this perception is far from the truth.

In addition to peddling studies that bolster a policy position, the foundation-backed “news outlets” use their position to rebut any criticism of the integrity of the report. Through this process, foundations can both inject an environmental issue into the news stream, and frame the way the public perceives it.

i. The Park Foundation: Buying and Spreading Anti-Fracking Science

One of the best examples of this foundation-manifested echo chamber arises from the Ithaca, New York-based Park Foundation. It reported assets of over $366 million in 2012 and is run by Adelaide Park Gomer, who inherited her fortune from her late father, Roy Park. She is a fierce and vocal critic of fracking, especially in the Marcellus Shale region in New York and Pennsylvania. Her hostility to fracking likely arises from Park’s location in the Marcellus Shale region. Her environmental views are radical, as evidenced in a very strongly worded poem, Ballad of a Dying Planet, in which she laments the “rape and pillage” of the earth by mankind. In March 2010, the Park Foundation gave $100,000 to Cornell University (also located in Ithaca) for “A Comprehensive Economic Impact Analysis of Natural Gas Extraction in the Marcellus Shale.” In June 2010, Park gave Cornell another $35,000 for “a study
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estimating the greenhouse gas consequences of Marcellus Shale gas.” According to some contemporaneous accounts, ecologist Robert Howarth admitted to meeting with Park representatives and agreeing with them to create a report finding that fracking was environmentally harmful.

Consequently, Cornell published Howarth’s study in spring 2011, which found that fracking the Marcellus Shale produces more greenhouse gas emissions than coal mining. The study was almost immediately discredited by other scientists, and even by environmentalists and Howarth’s colleagues at Cornell, based on flaws in the research and data. Despite such criticism, Park continues to fund Cornell’s anti-fracking research and has given an additional $193,229 since 2010.

Since the spring 2011 study, Cornell’s Park-funded anti-fracking efforts have received extensive attention from Park-linked far-left environmental media sources. Park funded news outlets such as Earth Island Journal (who received $31,500 from Park between 2010 and 2012) and Yes! magazine (who received $50,000 from Park between 2010 and 2012) supported and defended Howarth and his Cornell study. In fact in January 2012, long after the controversy erupted, an article in Yes! attacking fracking in the Marcellus Shale admiringly referred to Howarth as “co-author of last year’s landmark Cornell University study, which established the staggering greenhouse-gas footprint of fracking.” This is but one discreet example of the manufactured echo chamber.

Another example of Park’s paid-for propaganda involves an online news-sharing site called the Climate Desk. It describes itself as a “journalistic collaboration dedicated to exploring
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the impact... of climate change.”\textsuperscript{218} In reality, it aids the exchange and spread of climate-related news stories between generally left-leaning news partners that include \textit{Grist}, \textit{Mother Jones}, the \textit{Huffington Post}, \textit{Slate}, \textit{The Guardian} and \textit{The Atlantic}.	extsuperscript{219} The Climate Desk acknowledges Park is one of its “major funders”\textsuperscript{220} and Park’s IRS Form-990s and its 2013 online grants database reflect that Park gave $300,000 to the Climate Desk between 2010 and 2013.\textsuperscript{221}

A review of the online article databases of Climate Desk partners, The Huffington Post,\textsuperscript{222} Mother Jones,\textsuperscript{223} The Atlantic,\textsuperscript{224} and The Guardian,\textsuperscript{225} show that since 2011 they have all favorably cited Howarth and his work on the effects of fracking.\textsuperscript{226} Accordingly, through the Climate Desk, Park enabled a coalition of environmentally friendly news groups to share and spread stories involving researchers and work paid for by Park. However, Park’s influence in this situation reaches deeper than simply backing the Climate Desk. Between 2010 and 2013, Park gave Grist $95,000 and Mother Jones (through its parent organization, The Foundation for National Progress) $170,000.\textsuperscript{227} Following the fallout from Cornell’s Howarth-led fracking report, Grist published an article standing by the report even while admitting it had been discredited.\textsuperscript{228} Mother Jones published a complimentary story on it soon after the report was published, including a noncritical interview with Howarth.\textsuperscript{229} Mother Jones continued promoting the study even after it was discredited.\textsuperscript{230}

Another clear example of Park’s purchased propaganda involves Duke University’s Nicholas School of the Environment. The Institute, which used to employ disgraced bureaucrat Robert Brenner, received $50,000 from Park in 2011 for, “the completion of a study of the impact of gas drilling and hydraulic fracturing on water quality...”\textsuperscript{231} In October 2013, the Nicholas School published a report finding that fracking byproducts contaminate drinking water

\textsuperscript{219} Id.
\textsuperscript{220} Id.
\textsuperscript{225} Bobby Magill, \textit{Thousands of fracking wells in Pennsylvania 'may be leaking methane'}, THE GUARDIAN, June 20, 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jun/20/fracking-wells-pennsylvania-leaking-methane
\textsuperscript{226} See also Inside Climate News, http://insideclimatetemews.org/about/our-funders, which is a Park-funded media organization that also promoted the Cornell study. Similar to \textit{Climate News Desk}, it is in partnership with other news media outlets, including Bloomberg, the Associated Press, and The Weather Channel; http://insideclimatetemews.org/about/media-partners.
\textsuperscript{231} Park Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2011.
in the Marcellus Shale region.\textsuperscript{232} The study was criticized as being at odds with other studies on the subject.\textsuperscript{233} Although acknowledging receiving thousands of dollars from Park, the study’s lead researcher denied any Park-related bias.\textsuperscript{234} He claimed that Park’s money was merely used for “field work” and not for the specific purpose of producing a study on shale gas, as Park represented to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).\textsuperscript{235}

Following the report’s release, Climate Desk partners The Guardian\textsuperscript{236} and Huffington Post\textsuperscript{237} immediately published favorable stories on the study. The Guardian’s story was reproduced by Mother Jones “as part of the Climate Desk collaboration.”\textsuperscript{238} Filmmaker and well known anti-fracking activist Josh Fox posted the Mother Jones’ link on his Twitter page, where it was spread by Fox’s Twitter followers.\textsuperscript{239} Fox has received hundreds of thousands of dollars from Park to finance his anti-fracking series of documentaries called Gasland.\textsuperscript{240} Thus, a story reporting on a Park-supported anti-fracking study was reproduced by a Park-funded news organization through a Park-funded media collaboration, where it was then further disseminated on Twitter by the maker of Park-backed anti-fracking movies.

\textbf{ii. The Schmidt Family Foundation: Peddling Anti-Fracking Science}

The Schmidt Family Foundation, through its 11th Hour Project, is another example of a big foundation funding an echo chamber that promotes its propaganda. Schmidt is based in California, has reported assets of $312,189,881, and gives mostly to organizations focusing on climate change, fracking and other environmental causes.\textsuperscript{241} Schmidt’s grant philosophy offers a strong example of prescriptive grantmaking previously discussed in this report. Its website advises: “Please note, all of the Foundation's grantmaking is now done on a strictly invitational basis and we will not review proposals received either in the mail or to our email inbox. We proactively seek new partnerships based on our program area strategies.”\textsuperscript{242}


\textsuperscript{234} Id.

\textsuperscript{235} Id.

\textsuperscript{236} Carus, \textit{supra} note 233.


\textsuperscript{238} Id., \textit{supra} note 233.


\textsuperscript{241} 2012 is the most recent I.R.S. Form 990 that is currently available for the Schmidt Family Foundation.

\textsuperscript{242} http://www.11thhourproject.org/grantees.
In 2011, Schmidt made a grant of $50,000 to the Environmental Working Group (EWG), a Washington, D.C. based environmental research organization, \(^{243}\) “[t]o support the creation of case study on hydro-fracking in CA.” \(^{244}\) EWG’s directors include Drummond Pike of Tides (Tides Foundation also funds EWG \(^{245}\)) and Laura Turner Seydel of the Turner Foundation. \(^{246}\) In February 2012, EWG released a report on fracking entitled “California Regulator: See No Fracking, Speak no Fracking.” \(^{247}\) The study’s Acknowledgments recognized that funding, “was made possible thanks to the generosity of the 11th Hour Foundation, The Park Foundation, the Civil Society Institute and EWG’s community of online supporters.” \(^{248}\) The below graphic depicts the funding stream.

The report was mostly reported on by outlets backed by Park and Schmidt. In fact, *Mother Jones* covered it favorably in a February 29, 2012 story \(^{249}\) possibly as a direct result of Schmidt’s $225,000.00 donation to *Mother Jones* in 2012 “To support food & environmental reporting, public affairs outreach.” \(^{250}\) Schmidt has also donated $850,000 to *Grist* between 2010 and 2012. \(^{251}\) Its 2012 donation of $300,000 to *Grist* was “To provide general operating support,


\(^{244}\) Schmidt Family Foundation Form, IRS Form 990, 2011.

\(^{245}\) Tides Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2011-2013.


\(^{247}\) Renee Sharp and Bill Allayaud, CALIFORNIA REGULATORS: SEE NO FRACKING, SPEAK NO FRACKING (Feb. 2012).

http://static.ewg.org/reports/2012/fracking/ca_fracking/ca_regulators_see_no_fracking.pdf

\(^{248}\) Id. at p. 3.

\(^{249}\) Kiera Butler, *California Government Has No Idea Fracking Is Happening*, MOTHER JONES (Feb. 29, 2012),

http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2012/02/california-fracking.

\(^{250}\) Schmidt Family Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2012.

\(^{251}\) Schmidt Family Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2011 & 2012.
environmental news & commentary on the web.252 Grist also reported on the EWG study.253 Accordingly, Schmidt, along with Park, are two examples of foundations using their grant powers to create news on their environmental interests and then spread the news to the public in a manner that supports their views.

b. Activist Groups Provide Billionaire’s Club with Artificial Grassroots Movements

The Committee’s review has uncovered evidence that another service provided to the Billionaire’s Club is the manufacturing of an artificial grassroots movement. “Grassroots” is a commonly used and exploited term by far-left organizations. Webster’s Dictionary defines grassroots as “the ordinary people in a society or organization: the people who do not have a lot of money and power.”254 General characteristics of a grassroots movement include natural, spontaneous and volunteer-based action that originates locally with citizens who unite around a common issue or cause within their community.255 Environmental groups have misleadingly used the grassroots label to gain credibility among the populace and to hide, among other things, their substantial funding, well-organized structures and powerful influence. In the case studies discussed herein, the movement sprung from the efforts of the Billionaire’s Club, and not from local concern as is the grassroots’ spirit.

Critically, it is not the citizens’ interests that drive the movement; rather it is part of a well-funded national strategy. In these instances, groups represent themselves as local efforts, but the real direction comes from agenda-driven far-left elites hundreds of miles away on the East and West coasts. This section describes ways of achieving the illusion of a grassroots movement, including through a mechanism called a “fiscal sponsor” and by using a secondary foundation to further spread money to activists groups.

i. Fiscal Sponsorships Facilitate Artificial Grassroots Movements to Attack Fracking

In New York and Colorado a pseudo-grassroots effort to attack hydraulic fracturing has germinated from massive amounts of funding by three foundations: Schmidt Family Foundation, Tides Foundation and Park Foundation. Since each of these foundations is believed to be part of the exclusive and nontransparent Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA), it is no surprise they coordinated funding schemes to achieve a desired outcome. Moreover, in typical
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secretive billionaire donor fashion, the foundations’ funding was funneled through fiscal sponsors. Funding through these intermediary organizations, such as the Sustainable Markets Foundation (SMF) and Food & Water Watch, create distance between the wealthy foundations and alleged community-based outfits.

The Committee uncovered two parallel funding schemes with the shared goal of replicating environmentalists’ anti-fracking efforts from New York to hot-bed Colorado. In New York, environmentalists have experienced successes on the anti-fracking front as a temporary ban on the practice is currently in place,256 and just last month the New York Court of Appeals upheld two local fracking bans;257 concurrently, the above three private foundations have doled out millions to promote these efforts.

One scheme, led by the New York-based Park Foundation and California-based Schmidt Family Foundation, provides numerous grants to the New York-based SMF, which serves as the fiscal sponsor for multiple New York groups engaged in this effort, including Water Defense, Frack Action and Artists Against Fracking. During 2011, SMF gave $147,750 to Water Defense.258 The following year, SMF funneled a $150,000 grant “to support Water Defense” from Schmidt.259 Notably, Water Defense was founded in 2010 by actor Mark Ruffalo, who has an estimated net worth of $20 million and was listed on Time Magazines’ 2011 “People Who Mattered” for his anti-fracking efforts.260 In 2011, SMF gave Frack Action $324,198, with $150,000 stemming from Schmidt grants to SMF.261 Ironically, one of the Schmidt grants specified that $100,000 go “to support Frack Action’s grassroots campaign fighting for a ban on horizontal hydraulic fracturing.”262 (emphasis added).

However, the mere funding from the California-based Schmidt demonstrates Frack Action’s campaign is anything but grassroots. In 2012, SMF received $185,000 for Frack Action through grants from Park263 and Schmidt.264 While the amount of money funneled to Yoko Ono’s Artists Against Fracking cannot be identified, as SMF’s 2012 IRS Form-990 is unavailable, Artists Against Fracking’s now-removed website directs donations to SMF.265

Simultaneously, Park and Schmidt formed a parallel effort, along with the CA-based Tides Foundation, to funnel money to anti-fracking efforts in Colorado through Food & Water Watch. Food & Water Watch was founded in 2005 as an outgrowth of another Ralph Nader-
formed nonprofit, Public Citizen. Food & Water Watch’s Executive Director, Wenonah Hauter, served as Director of Public Citizen’s Energy and Environment Program from 1997 to 2005, and was a senior organizer for the Union of Concerned Scientists. Notably, the DC-based Food & Water Watch is an organization heavily funded by billionaire-backed foundations in California and New York, yet extremely active in environmentalist’s anti-fracking initiative in New York and Colorado. Moreover, Food & Water Watch boasts about the “wave of local resolutions, laws and proposals to ban or limit fracking” in New Jersey, Colorado, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and North Carolina. Specifically in New York, SMF gave Food & Water Watch $14,250 in 2011, and Schmidt contributed $65,000 in 2012, “to support education and outreach on fracking in New York.” Park donated $590,000 from 2010 to 2013 to Food & Water Watch to advocate for anti-fracking rallies in New York. Park’s $355,000 grant to Food & Water Watch was specifically for New Yorkers Against Fracking – another group not recognized by the IRS, but whose website has a link to the donations page of Food & Water Watch.

The same billionaire foundations behind the New York anti-fracking efforts have also moved into Colorado through two coalitions - Local Control Colorado and Frack Free Colorado, which are directly affiliated with the NY-based groups already discussed. Local Control Colorado claims to be, “a coalition of community, consumer and public interest groups from across Colorado” (emphasis added) promoting an anti-fracking ballot measure. However, they list DC-based Food & Water Watch, which is funded by CA-based Schmidt and Tides, and NY-based Park, as part of the coalition. Food & Water Watch is also listed as a partner to another member of the Local Control Colorado coalition, Frack Free Colorado (FFC). Self-described as a “collaborative, grassroots movement that works to raise awareness about the dangers of fracking,” FFC’s website states the group is “a people’s movement that consists of concerned citizens, companies … and organizations.” However, at least two of the organizations listed as a member of FFC – Artists Against Fracking and Food &
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Water Watch – are based in New York and Washington, DC. Interestingly, FFC has reportedly tried to hide its partnership with another NY-based organization, Water Defense.279

In addition to the funding and partnership ties, these schemes have one key employee in common who binds these cross-country efforts: Russell Mendell. Mendell previously worked for three of the NY-based organizations – Frack Action, New Yorkers Against Fracking and Water Defense.280 While at Frack Action in November 2011, Mendell organized a rally of activists in front of the White House calling for the rejection of the Keystone XL pipeline.281 Mendell was also active in the Occupy Wall Street movement, once stating that Occupy was “about linking arms between the various movements … there’s not a lot that separates the environmental movement and Occupy Wall Street.”282 In 2012, Mendell, along with another Water Defense employee, Ana Tinsely, left to move across the country and work for FFC283 in an apparent coordinated effort to apply the same activist tactics used in New York to the attack on fracking in Colorado. Overall, these schemes illustrate a model with FFC and Local Control Colorado “grassroots” coalitions that bind efforts via partnerships with billionaire-backed groups that are far from local. These complicated relationships are depicted in the following illustration.
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ii. **Virginia Organizing:Appearances are Deceiving**

Virginia Organizing claims to be a “statewide grassroots organization dedicated to challenging injustice by empowering people in local communities to address issues that affect their lives” (emphasis added); 284 yet money funneled into the organization comes from wealthy donors across the country and money disbursed by the organization extends well outside Virginia. Its Executive Director is Joe Szakos, a well-known community organizer with connections to the Obama Administration. 285 Before establishing Virginia Organizing in 1995, he was the coordinator of Kentuckians for the Commonwealth and has written two books, “We Make Change” and “Lessons from the Field,” which is required reading for students in community organizing courses, along with Saul Alinsky’s “Rules for Radicals.” 286 His wife, Kristin Szakos, is a local politician and prominent supporter of President Obama. She was a
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delegate at the 2008 convention, and has made campaign appearances with Michelle Obama.

Virginia Organizing is remarkable because the supposedly humble grassroots group receives millions in donations from major foundations – primarily the Marisla Foundation, which gave nearly $1.3 million from 2010 to 2012 and Sea Change, which donated $600,000 in 2010 and 2011. They have also received hefty funding from the Tides Foundation, the Rockefeller Family Fund, the Park Foundation, as well as others. Additionally, they have established more than two dozen fiscal sponsorships, which they dub “partners” on their website and filings. One of their sponsored charities is Environmental Health News (EHN), which claims to be an independent, nonprofit news organization founded in 2002. Nowhere on its website is the relationship with Virginia Organizing advertised, and it is only disclosed on the donation page, where they instruct potential donors to make checks payable to Virginia Organizing.

EHN has been generously supported by members of the EGA, as it has received $675,000 from Marisla between 2010 and 2012 and also lists grants from the Heinz Endowments, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. Their support from the Billionaire’s Club might be linked to EHN’s founder, Pete Myers, who served as director at the W. Alton Jones Foundation and is a trustee for the Jennifer Altman Foundation, which is believed to be a member of EGA. He also serves as a board chair of the Heinz III Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment.

Virginia Organizing is also the fiscal sponsor for the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition and the Southern Appalachian Mountain Stewards – two groups working against coal mining in Appalachia suing to expand EPA’s authority.

Virginia Organizing is the fiscal sponsor for the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition and the Southern Appalachian Mountain Stewards – two groups working against coal mining in Appalachia suing to expand EPA’s authority.
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iii. Bold Nebraska: Billionaire’s Club Disguised as Local Initiative to Oppose Keystone XL Pipeline

Bold Nebraska is a 501(c)(4) nonprofit whose primary cause is opposing the Keystone XL pipeline’s planned path through Nebraska. It was founded in 2010 by Jane Fleming Kleeb, a South Florida native who was educated in Washington, D.C.293 She first moved to Nebraska in 2007294 when she married Scott Kleeb, an energy company CEO who lost bids to represent Nebraska in Congress in 2006295 and in the Senate in 2008 as a Democrat.296 Outside of Nebraska, Kleeb is clearly the face, voice and driving force of Bold Nebraska. She has been prominently featured in national media outlets that include The New York Times297 and MSNBC.298 Nonetheless, the organization’s website downplays her involvement and lists her only as a staff member, while other individuals with deeper, more conspicuous Nebraska ties serve in leadership roles and on the Board of Directors.299

Bold Nebraska projects itself as a Nebraska-based and progressively oriented organization, proclaiming on its website: “Nebraskans are bold. We are pioneers. We are reformers. We are independent. Bold Nebraska is setting out to change the political landscape and restore political balance. We are going back to our roots and we need your help to build a Bold Nebraska.”300 However, underlying Bold Nebraska’s homespun, grassroots façade is a significant, growing, well-funded and well-organized financial support network originating from wealthy far-left environmental interests thousands of miles away. A brief but revealing portion of a May 2014 article on Kleeb in The New York Times Magazine documents both her efforts to attract rich out-of-state donors to Bold Nebraska, and her carefully crafted strategy for selling the “grassroots” charm of the group to the moneyed elites. It recounts:

[Kleeb] was in the middle of a fund-raising call with progressive donors, including the California billionaire Tom Steyer, who were interested in rural organizing and fighting climate change. But Kleeb was careful not to use the word ‘environment’ or mention climate change, preferring to talk ‘about the land’ and the rich foreigners putting the country’s water at risk. ‘Donors crave a much more
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authentic voice,’ she explained. ‘We have a connection to rural communities that many other progressive groups just don’t have.’

The irony of Bold Nebraska’s grassroots image, as evident in Kleeb’s comments, is that it is nothing more than a cover for wealthy and distant non-Nebraskan interests who seek to advance a political agenda without drawing attention to the fact that they, too, are outsiders with little interest in or connection to the state. One of these outsiders is none other than Tom Steyer, who has a strong conflict of interest in opposing Keystone XL due to his financial stake in a competing pipeline called Kinder Morgan. Despite claiming that he would sell off all interests in the Kinder Morgan pipeline by late 2013, it was still unclear as of June 2014 whether Steyer followed through on that promise.

Kleeb and Bold Nebraska have succeeded in attracting the attention and deep pockets of the big foundations. In 2012, the San Francisco-based Tides Foundation gave it $50,000, and Tides’ San Francisco-based 501(c)(4) group, The Advocacy Fund, gave $15,000. These two donations equaled one-third of Bold Nebraska’s total contributions received in 2012. In 2013, Tides Foundation almost doubled its 2012 grant by giving $90,000.

Out-of-state environmental groups have also used Bold Nebraska to influence local elections through its New Energy Voter initiative. The program was created to mobilize Nebraskans to vote for candidates opposing the Keystone XL’s expansion. It makes recommendations and endorsements on candidates for local, state and federal elections in Nebraska. During the 2012 election cycle, New Energy Voter defined itself as “an effort by citizen groups” that included support from the California-based Sierra Club and New York-based 350.org. Besides the fact that these two big environmental groups are not from Nebraska, and not grassroots organizations, the question arises as to whether 350.org, as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, exceeded the strict parameters of its tax-exempt status by participating in and advocating for political campaigns.
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While Bold Nebraska is essentially a tool for the Billionaire’s Club and their allies opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline, many in the state remain oblivious to this fact. Moreover, President Obama has supported Bold Nebraska and the billionaire funders’ efforts by not authorizing the pipeline despite broad public opinion favoring its construction. 310

iv. **Activist Organizations Serve as Pass-Throughs, Leveraging Additional Influence While Creating the Appearance of Diverse Support**

The Energy Foundation is a prime example of a “pass through” public charity, which receives massive amounts of funding from private foundations. The Energy Foundation then funds a variety of activist organizations. As opposed to a fiscal sponsor that assesses a fee to collect money on behalf of unrecognized groups, a pass through foundation contributes money to recognized charities.

The Energy Foundation was formed as a pass through with a $20 million endowment donated by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Rockefeller Foundation and the John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. 311 Currently, the Energy Foundation’s website lists the
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Moreover, the Board of Directors of the Energy Foundation consists of individuals that either previously or currently serve on the Board of Directors for one of its partnering foundations. Such members include Mark Burget, who was previously President of ClimateWorks Foundation; Khee Poh Lam, who is also a partner of ClimateWorks Foundation Network;313 and Noa Staryk, who previously sat on the board of the McKnight Foundation.314

In addition to funding from its partners, the Energy Foundation is the largest recipient of grants from the foreign-funded Sea Change Foundation; yet it appears the Energy Foundation wants to hide donations from Sea Change, as it is not listed as one of the Energy Foundation’s partners. In fact, in 2011 Sea Change’s $13,966,672 in grants to the Energy Foundation provided nearly 15% of the Energy Foundation’s total contributions and grants revenue; in sharp contrast to a listed partner, Schmidt Family Foundation, who provided $750,000 to the Energy Foundation in 2011. The Energy Foundation, in turn, donates heavily to activist organizations and other foundations. As depicted in the table below, million dollar grantees of the Energy Foundation include: ALA, Blue Green Alliance, EDF, LCV, NRDC, Sierra Club and UCS.315

**Energy Foundation Million Dollar Activist Grantees 2010-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ALA</th>
<th>Blue Green Alliance</th>
<th>EDF</th>
<th>LCV</th>
<th>NRDC</th>
<th>Sierra Club</th>
<th>UCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These groups are also big dollar grantees of foundations funneling funds into the Energy Foundation. For example, the Schmidt Family Foundation donated $50,000 to ALA in 2012, $170,000 to Blue Green Alliance in 2012, $1,500,000 to NRDC between 2010-2012 and $500,000 to Sierra Club between 2011-2012; The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation donated $600,000 to EDF between 2011-2013, $375,000 to LCVEF from 2012-2013, $2,425,000 to NRDC from 2012-2013 as well as $2,520,000 to Sierra Club between 2011-2013; and ClimateWorks Foundation donated $80,000 to NRDC in 2012 and $690,000 to UCS in 2012. The funding paths and the transfer of money in and around the Energy Foundation are depicted graphically below.

Thus, the Energy Foundation is a pass through utilized by the most powerful EGA members. They use it to create the appearance of a more diversified base of support, to shield
them from accountability, and to leverage limited resources by hiring dedicated
energy/environment staff to handle strategic giving.

c. Converting Charitable Donations into Political Outcomes

As previously discussed, foundations, public charities and activist organizations that
register as 501(c)(3) organizations receive certain tax benefits under the law. In return, there are
strict limitations on how the money can be spent. For example, as also previously discussed,
501(c)(3) groups are strictly forbidden from “directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening
in a political campaign for or against a candidate for political office.” Accordingly, the
Billionaire’s Club and activist groups organized as public charities have limited means to
influence elections without jeopardizing their designated tax exempt status.

However, the Committee found that in many cases a 501(c)(3) will transfer funds to an
affiliated 501(c)(4), which can engage in political activity. Under the law, these donations must
only be used for activities within the permissible scope of the 501(c)(3)’s activities. It is
uncertain whether the IRS strictly oversees to ensure this requirement is met. This is especially
ture given the enormous and difficult task of tracking and accounting for the vast sums of money
that pass through several different groups. Although the IRS Form 990s provide space to
describe the purpose of a group’s grant, the descriptions given are often vague and overly broad.
The circumstances surrounding the flow of money from 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) groups, and the
likelihood of lax oversight, raises questions as to whether 501(c)(3) nonprofit foundations and
charities are indirectly funding political activities.

i. The Billionaire’s Club May Take Advantage of Lax Oversight and Vague
Reporting Requirements

To better understand how the Billionaire’s Club can convert tax deductible donations to
political outcomes, the Committee examined the donations made to Green Tech Action Fund, a
501(c)(4) group founded in 2008 and affiliated with the Energy Foundation. Green Tech’s
only internet presence is a one-page website that notes its link to the Energy Foundation, its
nonprofit status, and discourages grant seekers from submitting any grant pitches by advising:
“Please note, we do not accept unsolicited proposals.”
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Green Tech’s modest webpage masks the fact that it receives millions of dollars from green nonprofit foundations and then distributes millions of dollars to 501(c)(4) groups that donate to political campaigns. One example involves the flow of money from the Hewlett Foundation and Packard Foundation through Green Tech. Between 2010 and 2012, both foundations donated hundreds of millions of dollars to ClimateWorks Foundation, a 501(c)(3) foundation.\footnote{A} ClimateWorks then gave nearly $170 million to the Energy Foundation.\footnote{B} Hewlett and Packard gave directly to the Energy Foundation.\footnote{C} The Energy Foundation then gave $5,676,000 to Green Tech, and ClimateWorks gave it $1,520,000.\footnote{A} 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. The 2011 description states: “To support clean energy policies,”\footnote{D} while in 2012 the purpose is listed as: “To advance clean technology markets, especially energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.”\footnote{E}

Green Tech, in turn, donated heavily to at least three 501(c)(4) far-left environmental activist organizations during the 2010 and 2012 election cycles: the League of Conservation
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\footnotetext{G}{[B] ClimateWorks Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2012}  
\footnotetext{H}{[A] Energy Found., IRS Form 990, 2011.}  
\footnotetext{I}{[A] Energy Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.}
Voters, Sierra Club, and the BlueGreen Alliance. Those groups gave predominantly, if not entirely, to Democrat candidates for office. These relationships are illustrated below.

This dizzying flow of big money raises obvious questions. How can all the money be properly accounted for to ensure that the tax laws are followed? How can one be sure, for example, that some of the millions of dollars that originated with the Hewlett and Packard Foundations did not (directly or indirectly) fund a political candidate for office? It is unclear whether the IRS has the resources, or the political will, to carefully track all this money to ensure tax laws are followed. What is clear, though, is that this scheme offers ambitious big moneyed donors the opportunity to fund political outcomes with tax exempt funds.

**ii. Activist Public Charities Funnel Money to Political Affiliates**

Many of the large environmental organizations form both 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) nonprofits that are publically advertised as separate and independent entities. In reality, they are closely associated groups that transfer money from the Billionaire’s Club to nonprofits, and eventually into political campaigns. For example, the League of Conservation Voters (LCV) is a 501(c)(4) group with an affiliated 501(c)(3) nonprofit almost identically named the League of Conservation Voters Education Fund (LCV Education Fund). In 2012, LCV Education Fund
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had total assets of just over $8 million and net assets of over $7.3 million. According to LCV, LCV Education Fund is “separate from the League of Conservation Voters, with its own mission, programs, and Board of Directors.” Even so, the two groups are very closely intertwined. Forty percent of LCV Education Fund’s Board of Directors also serve on LCV’s Board of Directors.

An examination of the money flow shows not only the interconnectedness between LCV and LCV Education Fund, but also the heavy influence of the Billionaire’s Club. LCV Education Fund received over $9 million from the Sea Change Foundation between 2010 and 2011; over $450,000 from Marisla Foundation between 2010 and 2012; $370,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation in 2012; $105,000 from Rockefeller Family Foundation; over $700,000 from the Tides Foundation between 2010 and 2013; and over $1.3 million from the Energy Foundation between 2010 and 2012. Interestingly, 95% of the Energy Foundation’s giving to LCV Education Fund during that time occurred in the 2010 and 2012 election years.

In turn, LCV Education Fund gave over $2 million to LCV in both 2010 and 2011, and over $4.6 million in 2012. Tides’ 501(c)(4), the Advocacy Fund, and Green Tech Action Fund (Energy Foundation’s 501(c)(4) group) each gave LCV over $2 million in each of the 2010 and 2012 elections years. In 2010, LCV gave almost $1 million to their candidates and in 2012, LCV gave over $1.4 million to candidates. As of July 2014, LCV has given over $800,000 to the 2014 elections.
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In addition to LCV, the National Resources Defense Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club and 350.org also set up affiliate nonprofit organizations to operate in this manner. The large amounts of money, multiple transfers, and questionable
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regulation strongly suggest that 501(c)(3) environmental groups and foundations are exceeding the scope of their tax exempt limits by financially supporting politically active 501(c)(4)s.

d. Fiscal Sponsorships Provide the Billionaire’s Club with Access to Nimble and Transient Groups and also Provide Distance from their Hired Hands

Fiscal sponsorship arrangements provide the Billionaire’s Club with access to nimble and transient groups to address fast moving political developments. As discussed in this report, fiscal sponsors rent out their 501(c)(3) status to outfits that are not recognized by the IRS. This arrangement allows foundation funds to flow to activists who would not otherwise qualify to receive foundation money as most private foundations have guidelines that explicitly require grantees to be recognized as tax-exempt by the IRS. Additionally, as the fiscal sponsor is generally a well-known and well regarded nonprofit, the arrangement provides distance between the wealthy donor and the actions of their hired hands.

i. Tides Center: The Principal Fiscal Sponsor

Tides Inc., a group of separate yet closely intertwined organizations, sets the standard in inventing the infrastructure behind the fiscal sponsor relationship. Tides heavily funds green organizations and its setup provides one stop shopping for the Billionaire’s Club. The Tides Foundation and the Tides Center are the most prominent affiliates of Tides Inc. The Tides Foundation is a 501(c)(3) organization based in San Francisco founded in 1976 by Drummond Pike, an activist environmentalist with connections to other left-leaning foundations and organizations. Tides Foundation reported net total assets of over $135,000,000 in 2012. It takes in large sums of money from other large foundations, including the Hewlett Family Foundation, Schmidt Family Foundation, Ocean Conservancy, and Sea Change Foundation. A key component of the Tides’ operations involves maintaining donor anonymity.

The Tides Center is also a 501(c)(3) organization founded in 1994 and based in San Francisco. It promotes itself as “the leading fiscal sponsor in the nation,” and boasts of sponsoring roughly 230 projects. It receives money from Hewlett, Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, Schmidt, Sea Change, Marisla Foundation and Energy Foundation. Both Tides Foundation and Tides Center heavily support each other. Between 2010 and 2012, Tides Foundation gave over $10 million to Tides Center, and Tides Center gave over $39 million to Tides Foundation. It is unclear what purpose the transfer of funds between these two organizations serves, other than obscuring the money trail.
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TOTAL GRANTS BETWEEN TIDES FOUNDATION & TIDES CENTER 2010-2012

$39,012,027

Tides Foundation
501(c)(3)

$10,047,801

Tides Center
501(c)(3)

As a prominent and highly active fiscal sponsor, Tides Center exerts the Tides’ influence both through controlling funding allocations to its sponsored groups, but also through overseeing their structures, staff, and activities. Tides Center describes its close, intertwined relationship with the groups it sponsors by stating: “Tides’ projects are not separate entities or affiliated organizations. Because they are an integral part of Tides Center and not separate legal entities, projects are able to receive charitable donations and grants available only to tax-exempt organizations. Tides Center is legally and financially responsible for all our projects and activities.”

Groups that Tides Center sponsors are subject to Tides Center’s oversight and direction in important aspects that include forming a governing board, managing payroll, and monitoring risk. Tides Center stresses its hands-on involvement with its sponsored projects by stating: “Every Tides Center staff member is invested in the success, growth, and achievement of our projects. We continually strive to improve our work and streamline processes so that the provision of services to each project is seamless.” In return, Tides Center profits through charging an amount equaling 9% of its sponsored groups’ annual revenues, with a slight percentage reduction in later years for revenues exceeding $1 million.

Despite the influence exerted by the Tides Center’s over a group it sponsors, generally their relationship is not always evident from looking at the group. One example is the Story of Stuff project based in Berkeley, California. It produces movies, podcasts and other mediums that perpetuate
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propaganda on climate change and environmental issues. Its founder, Annie Leonard, has been associated with various green groups, including Greenpeace. One of its most notable works is a propaganda movie called *The Story of Stuff*. On its website, Tides Center boasts:

With over 12 million online views, *The Story of Stuff* with Annie Leonard is one of the most widely viewed environmental-themed short films of all time. Since its release in December 2007, *The Story of Stuff* has been shown in thousands of schools, houses of worship, community events, and businesses, and translated into 10 languages. It reveals the connections, at times hidden, between the environmental, social, and economic issues which surround consumerism, and it has inspired a global movement.

Nonetheless, there is no mention of the Tides Center on the Story of Stuff’s website except for a passing reference on a separate “questions” page linked on the donations page that confirms that contributions are tax deductible due to the fiscal sponsorship arrangement.

Source: https://storyofstuff.actionkit.com/donate/general_donations/

Tides Center-sponsored projects also associate closely with organizations that receive money from Tides Foundation. For example, Tides Center fiscally sponsors The Center for Environment and Policy (CEP), which conducts research and advocacy associated with
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sustainable development and populations. CEP partners with multiple groups that receive
donations from Tides Foundation, including The Nature Conservancy, National Wildlife
Federation, Sierra Club, League of Conservation Voters, and Union of Concerned Scientists.

ii. Sustainable Markets Foundation: An Up and Coming Far-Left Fiscal Sponsor

The New York-based Sustainable Markets Foundation (SMF) is another significant fiscal sponsor. Unlike Tides, Inc., it is a relatively unknown quantity. SMF only exists on paper and has zero public presence – no website, no Facebook page, no Twitter account, nothing. Accordingly, only an extensive review of its IRS Form-990s can inform the public of its activities; however, this review was limited to 2010 and 2011 because SMF’s IRS Form-990 for 2012 is not public. Through meticulous research, the Committee identified Jay Halfon, previously discussed in this report, as the director and general counsel of SMF. The group was also the fiscal sponsor of the controversial 350.org. Moreover, nearly all of the members of the Billionaire’s Club donate to SMF, including Schmidt, Global Wallace Fund, RFF, RBF, Park, Energy, and Tides.

The Committee also found that SMF is the fiscal sponsor to more groups than listed on its IRS Form-990. Overall, the Committee determined that SMF fiscally sponsors at least the following groups:

- Gas Free Seneca
- “Flowback Project”
- Frack Free Genesee
- Frack Action
- Coalition to Protect New York
- The Palast Investigative Fund
- Artists Against Fracking
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Since SMF only serves as a pass through to funnel money into these organizations, it is apparent that they are merely a tool for the Billionaire’s Club to facilitate the transfer of money to fringe startups.

1. **A SMF Project: “The Message”**

“The Message” is a multi-platform project on climate change. The first part of the project is a non-fiction book expected for release in fall 2014 by Naomi Klein, to be followed by a documentary currently in production. In 2011 and 2012, SMF received donations for and distributed grants to “The Message.” Specifically, in 2011, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund gave SMF $50,000 for “The Message,” Wallace Global Fund gave SMF $75,000 for “The Message,” and Schmidt Family Foundation gave $40,000 to SMF “to support development of a film titled, The Message.” While those donations total $165,000 in 2011, that year SMF gave $112,360 – the difference seemingly represents SMF’s fiscal sponsor fee. The following year, the Schmidt Family Foundation gave SMF $100,000 “to support ‘The Message’ film.”

Ms. Klein herself is a controversial figure. In 2011, she was very active in the Occupy Wall Street movement – giving speeches at two large events – where she sought to invigorate activists to combine their efforts with the environmentalists. That same year, she

---

376 Also lists 11th Hour Project (of Schmidt Foundation), Patagonia and Wallace Global Fund, among its funders. See http://noimpactproject.org/donate/
381 Schmidt Family Foundation IRS Form 990 (2011).
382 Schmidt Family Foundation IRS Form 990 (2012).
attended a demonstration outside the White House protesting the Keystone XL pipeline, where she was arrested. Ms. Klein’s extreme behavior may be a liability for billionaire foundations who want to maintain close control of the way their money is used. Conveniently, the SMF provides a means for the Billionaire’s Club to distance themselves from the activist Ms. Klein, while still funding her work.

2. A SMF Project: Physicians, Scientists & Engineers for Healthy Energy

SMF also funds Anthony Ingraffea’s Physicians, Scientists & Engineers for Healthy Energy – a producer of anti-fracking reports – with offices in New York and California. Ingraffea, a Cornell University professor, is widely known for his highly refuted 2011 study with Robert Howarth on methane emissions from shale oil and gas development. Despite the overall criticism of the report, he emerged as a prominent environmental ally for extreme activists. As Politico reported, “[h]e’ll admit, though, that he uses the platform high-profile environmentalists provide to “amplify” his advocacy to compete with the natural gas industry’s advertising and public relations machine.” For example, Time Magazine listed him and Howarth among the 2011 “People who Mattered,” along with actor and founder of Water Defense, Mark Ruffalo, for accelerating hydraulic fracturing to a national issue. He also joined Ruffalo on a panel hosted by Artists Against Fracking and participated in Josh Fox’s documentary Gasland Part II – two projects also relying on SMF for funding.

Mark Ruffalo (left), Anthony Ingraffea (center) and Sean Lennon (right)

---

In 2010 and 2011 SMF donated $140,000 to Ingraffea’s group, but it is not clear whether any of those funds were directed by private foundations. At a minimum, the Committee identified a $40,000 grant from the Park Foundation to SMF specifically for Ingraffea’s group in 2012. However, due to the large sums of money SMF received without descriptions from private foundations such as Rockefeller Family Fund, Wallace Global Fund, and Schmidt Family Foundation, one can assume the money to Ingraffea can be traced back to the Billionaire’s Club.

3. A SMF Project: Toxics Targeting

Walter Hang is another anti-fracking activist in upstate New York relying on SMF for funding. Hang appears to have a personal connection with SMF, as he along with three of the four members of SMF’s board, previously worked for PIRG. Hang has described his outfit, Toxics Targeting, as a firm providing services to a broad array of consumers: “...we help engineers, we help consultants, we help municipalities, we help newspapers, and we just never reveal anything about who our clients are or what the scope is or anything like that.” SMF transferred $281,000 in 2010 to Hang’s group.

In 2011, SMF transferred $304,163 to Hang. Moreover, in 2012 the California-based Schmidt Family Foundation funneled $135,000 through SMF “to support Toxics Targeting and their work towards clean energy in New York.”

Similar to Ms. Klein and Ingraffea, Hang is also controversial through his efforts to encourage protesters to support a fracking ban in New York. He states:

“It is imperative that activists vote with their feet and attend this landmark national gig. We must show up by the hundreds, if not the thousands... We need fracking activists from all over New York as well as Pennsylvania, Ohio and other states to make Friday a massive event.”

While the private foundations may agree with Hang’s overall objective, they may not want to associate with his means of achieving it. As such, SMF provides a convenient layer between rich liberal donors and Hang.

e. The Billionaire’s Club Collaborating with Shady Foreign Funders

The Committee has also uncovered evidence that the Billionaire’s Club knowingly collaborates with shady offshore funders to maximize support for the far-left environmental activists they sponsor. The Sea Change Foundation is a heavy contributor to the Energy
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392 Sustainable Markets Found. IRS Form 990 2011).
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Foundation, as discussed above. However, their donations are not advertised by the Energy
Foundation or the other donors, most likely because the vast majority of Sea Change’s funding
comes from a Bermuda based corporation that deliberately hides the source of their funds.

i.  **Sea Change Foundation and Bermuda-Based Donors**

Sea Change Foundation is a private foundation based in San Francisco, California. In
2011 Sea Change Foundation was the sixth largest donor to environmental causes, giving
$43,149,911 in grants to environmental and far-left environmental activists. While it is clear
Sea Change is a major player in funding the environmental movement, the foundation offers
almost no information to the public. The little information available on Sea Change is limited to
a review of its IRS Form-990 for 2010 and 2011 as its 2012 form is not public, and a sparse
website that only lists its logo and three-sentence mission.

Source: www.seachange.org.

Based on this limited information, the foundation has been summarized by Inside Philanthropy
as:

No more fundraising, just lots of check writing to some of the top organizations in
the environmental world. Big checks, too. And all without dealing with the
infamous bureaucracies of the large legacy foundations. Sea Change dispenses
millions of dollars in grants each year to organizations that promote clean energy
and work to reduce carbon emissions.\(^{397}\)

---

\(^{396}\) Environmental Grantmakers Association, *Tracking the Field Volume 4*, Oct. 9, 2013,

\(^{397}\) The Gatekeepers Guide to Top Program Officers & Foundation Executives: Stephen Colwell, Sea Change
Foundation, INSIDE PHILANTHROPY, http://insidephilanthropy.squarespace.com/insider-guide-to-program-
A review of the IRS Form 990s reveals that Nathaniel (“Nat”) Simons is the President of Sea Change, and his wife, Laura Baxter-Simons, is its Secretary. Nat and Laura predominately fund Sea Change through their own personal wealth, mostly attributed to their ties to Renaissance Technologies, a wildly profitably hedge fund. Nat was once a principal at Renaissance and currently serves on the board of Renaissance; Laura was an associate counsel at Renaissance. Notably, Nat’s father, James Simons founded Renaissance. James Simons has been described as “one of the richest people on the planet,” is ranked 34th on the Forbes’ Richest People in America, and 88th on the Forbes’ list of world billionaires with a net worth of $12 billion. In fact, the most recent data from the Center for Responsive Politics listed James and Nat’s mother, Marilyn Simons, as the #5 top contributor in the 2014 mid-term election cycle, donating 100% to Democrats – totaling $3,289,200. Nat also actively donates to political campaigns, including giving $15,000 to Obama’s 2009 Inaugural, and has given to dozens of Democratic candidates for Congress.

Nat also serves as CEO of Elan Management where he manages the early stages of clean tech companies with a focus on solar and wind energy sources. Similar to Sea Change, Elan is based in San Francisco. Elan also created Prelude Ventures in 2009, an investment firm dedicated to clean energy. Tim Woodward, Managing Director of Prelude Ventures, has made comments revealing Elan’s agenda: “we still believe that advancements in renewables from solar to wind will be important opportunities . . . Unfortunately, energy is still a very inexpensive resource in North America, and that can make it difficult for many customers to pay much attention” (emphasis added). Only an affiliate of the Billionaire’s Club invested in renewable technologies would express disappointment in low energy prices.

Aside from the Simons, Stephen Colwell is the Executive Director of Sea Change. He previously worked as a consultant for “foundations and high-net-worth individuals, building his own consulting practice based in Berkeley and working with top environmental funders in the

398 Sea Change Found. IRS Form 990-PF, 2011.
400 Id.
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Colwell’s statements at a 2010 Global Philanthropy Forum provide a better understanding of his perspective on environmental funding:

While today’s discussion will be able to touch on only a small part of the threats and the potential solutions to climate change, I hope by the end you’ll be clear on three points: The threats to humans caused by climate change are real and immediate. Climate change can be addressed now. There are cost-effective solutions. It is failing to address climate change that will be extraordinarily expensive, both in economic terms and in terms of human suffering. Philanthropists of all kinds, even those who don’t consider themselves environmental philanthropists, have an incredibly important role to play in this fight, and that’s part of what we’ll be discussing today. (emphasis added)

Sea Change’s IRS Form 990 also shows that in addition to funding by the Simons, the only other source of its contributions derives from a Bermuda-based company called Klein Ltd. It appears that Klein exists on paper only, as it does not have an internet presence, and was set up for the sole purpose of funneling anonymous donations to Sea Change. In 2010, Klein contributed $13 million to Sea Change, amounting to 49% of all contributions to Sea Change that year, and in 2011 Klein contributed $10 million to Sea Change, amounting to 33% of all contributions to Sea Change. Bermuda offer Klein government guaranteed anonymity for the sources of their donations. As a practical matter, an overseas company contributing tens of millions to organizations dedicated to abolishing the use of affordable fossil fuels is highly problematic. This is only compounded by the fact it is deliberately and completely lacking in transparency. However, it is likely this lack of transparency shields Klein Ltd. from any responsibility to the American businesses and families it hurts.

Importantly, Sea Change’s funding reveals massive amounts of grants to almost all the major environmental and far-left activists previously discussed in this report. A summary of these grants is compiled below.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Grants 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters Education Fund</td>
<td>$10,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club Foundation</td>
<td>$6,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,187,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for American Progress</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$33,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 and 2011 990-PF Forms

Sea Change also donates to other foundations that serve as pass-through entities such as the Energy Foundation, Tides, and Virginia Organizing that heavily donate to the same groups. Energy Foundation is the single largest recipient of funding from Sea Change receiving a total $27,924,440 in 2010 and 2011.414

All of Sea Change’s grants are focused on environmental issues. In fact, in 2010, Sea Change contributed $10,933,332 in grants to environmental organizations to “reduce reliance on high carbon energy.”415 The next year, 2011, Sea Change allocated nearly $10 million in grants for the same purpose. Thus, in 2010-2011, this one private foundation, which receives over 30% of its funding from a foreign overseas company, actively seeking to hide the source of its funding, contributed over $20 million dollars to fight domestic fossil energy production. The following graphic illustrates how funding from Klein Ltd. is funneled through Sea Change to prominent environmental organizations.
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414 Sea Change Found., IRS Form 990, 2010-2011.
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The role Sea Change plays as a member of the Billionaire’s Club is deeply troubling, especially in light of recent revelations that environmental activists, many of whom are clearly benefiting from this extreme “dark money,” do not have any moral qualms over where their money comes from – so long as it supports the far-left cause.\(^\text{416}\) This sentiment was captured by a recently released investigative video that revealed Hollywood producers of far-left environmental films were eager to accept Middle Eastern money to produce an anti-fracking video. Notably, in speaking with a man believed to represent rich Middle Eastern oil interests opposed to American energy independence through fracking, one producer said:

This is not the first major project that we’ve had funded through a funding source which you know, for various reasons – we didn’t disclose. It would have been very unwise for everybody to understand the dynamics of that funding. So we know how tricky it is…. It’s money, so in that sense we have no moral issue.\textsuperscript{417}

\textsuperscript{417}Id.
CONCLUSION

EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy recently told Congress that the Agency’s proposed Existing Source Performance Standards for coal fired power plants, which is widely believed to be the death knell for coal as an industry, was, in fact, an opportunity for economic growth: “The great thing about this proposal is that it really is an investment opportunity. This is not about pollution control. It’s about increased efficiency at our plants, no matter where you want to invest. It’s about investment in renewables and clean energy.”418 In fact, multiple sources, including the New York Times, have attributed the authorship of the proposal in large part to the “NRDC mafia,” including David Doniger, Daniel Lashof, and David Hawkins.419

As this report reveals, NRDC obtains a significant amount of donations from the Energy Foundation, which is heavily funded by Sea Change Foundation, whose major donors are heavily invested in renewable technologies. This report offers a new perspective on the “opportunities” McCarthy was referring to which are the economic opportunities of millionaires and billionaires who are part of the far-left environmental machine heavily invested in helping EPA advance such regulations. It is surely not an opportunity for Americans living in Appalachia or the Powder River Basin who depend on coal for their energy supply and livelihood, nor is it an economic opportunity for Americans already struggling to pay their energy bills.

Therein lies the importance of this report and the reason the Committee is dedicated to unraveling the puzzle presented by the questionable funding tactics of the far-left environmental community. Through a series of case studies, this report exposes the most politically active donors, explains how they use loopholes in the tax law to funnel tax deductible contributions to far-left environmental activist, and details how those activists turn the “investments” into political results. Moreover, the report uncovers the shocking lengths wealthy liberal donors are willing to take to hide their involvement in the scheme. Finally, the report shines a light on the alarming reality that unknown foreign investors are financing the environmental movement, using the shady Sea Change Foundation as cover.

The report uncovers how the EPA is very much an active partner in the far-left environmental movement, and even sponsors their efforts through grants to environmental activist. Former Assistant Administrator Michelle DePass and current Region 2 Administrator Judith Enck are far from the exception to the rule.

Finally, this report is necessarily limited in its scope and only scratches the surface in its effort to document the money trail. Furthermore, as the Committee’s jurisdiction is limited to oversight of the EPA and energy and environmental policy, so too this report is constrained to reviewing activities intended to influence such policy. There is an abundance of evidence to suggest that this system is replicated across the progressive coalition. More investigation and oversight is needed.

---

APPENDIX A: TOP FOUNDATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL GIVING

Private Foundations

**David and Lucile Packard Foundation**
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Los Altos, CA
EIN: 94-2278431
Total Assets: $6,299,952,716\(^{420}\)
EGA Member*: Yes

**Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation**
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Palo Alto, CA
EIN: 94-3397785
Total Assets: $5,697,258,026\(^{422}\)
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Gordon Moore – Chairman, Bruce Alberts, Rosina Bierbaum, James C. Gaither, Paul Gray, John Hennessy, Kathleen Justice-Moore, Kenneth G. Moore, Kristen L. Moore, Steven E. Moore, Kenneth F. Siebel

**Marisla Foundation**
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Laguna Beach, CA
EIN: 33-0200133
Total Assets: $51,482,397\(^{423}\)
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Unknown

**Park Foundation, Inc.**
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Ithaca, NY
EIN: 16-6071043
Total Assets: $366,405,008\(^{424}\)
EGA Member*: No

\(^{420}\) David and Lucile Packard Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.
\(^{422}\) Gordon and Betty Moore Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.
\(^{423}\) Marisla Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.
\(^{424}\) Park Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.

* Note: The Environmental Grantmakers Association does not disclose their membership list, so information included in this appendix is based on the best available information.
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc.
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: New York, NY
EIN: 13-1760106
Total Assets: $800,956,943
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Richard G. Rockefeller – Chairman, Joseph A. Pierson – Vice Chairman,
Stephen C. Rockefeller, David Rockefeller, Anne Bartley, Vali Nasr, R.
Nicholas Burns, Valerie Wayne, Miranda M. Kaiser, Wendy O’Neill, Timothy
O’Neill, Wendy Gordon, Justin Rockefeller, Arlene Shuler, Marsha Simms,
Kavita Ramdas, Stephen B. Heintz

Schmidt Family Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Palo Alto, CA
EIN: 20-4170342
Total Assets: $312,189,881
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Karen Krumholtz – Executive Director, Richard L. Schmidt, Barbara M.
Schmidt, Raymond J. Webb, JP Morgan Chase Bank

Sea Change Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 20-4952986
Total Assets: $124,350,435
EGA Member*: No
Board Members: Nathaniel Simons – President, Laura Baxter-Simons, Secretary

TomKat Charitable Trust
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 38-6866542
Total Assets: $177,849,515
EGA Member*: No
Board Members: Brooks Shumway - Executive Director, Kathryn Hall, Erin Eisenberg

TomKat Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: San Francisco, CA

* Note: The Environmental Grantmakers Association does not disclose their membership list, so information
included in this appendix is based on the best available information.
Wallace Global Fund
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Washington, DC
EIN: 80-0424607
Total Assets: $155,471,213
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Johanna Dominguez – Associate Director, Astra Wallace – Associate Director, Annie Leonard, Scott Wallace, Christy Wallace, Scott Fitzmorris

Walton Family Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Bentonville, AR
EIN: 13-3441466
Total Assets: $1,999,066,369
EGA Member*: No
Board Members: Unknown

William & Flora Hewlett Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Private Foundation
Registered: Menlo Park, CA
EIN: 94-1655673
Total Assets: $7,735,371,139
EGA Member*: Yes

ClimateWorks Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 26-2303250
Total Assets: $219,543,071

* Note: The Environmental Grantmakers Association does not disclose their membership list, so information included in this appendix is based on the best available information.
EGA Member*: No
Function: Pass-through Foundation
Board Members: Susan Tierney - Chair, Jamshyd N. Godrej, Larry Kramer, Carol S. Larson, Pamela Matson, Kristian Parker, Charlotte Pera, William K. Reilly

Energy Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 94-3126848
Total Assets: $32,212,733
EGA Member*: Yes
Function: Pass-through foundation
Board Members: Eric Heitz – President, Phil Sharp – Board Chair, Mark Burget, Stephen Harper, Khee Poh Lam, Kris Mayes, Bill Ritter, Jr., William Ruckelshuas, Noa Staryk, Sue Tierney, Michael Wang, Hongjun Zhang

Sustainable Markets Foundation
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: New York, NY
EIN: 13-4188834
Total Assets: $2,056,007
EGA Member*: No
Function: Pass-through Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor
Board Members: Elizabeth Hitchcock – President, Steve Kleinberg – Vice President, Geoff Boehm, Secretary/Treasurer, Jay Halfon – Director/General Counsel

Tides, Inc.
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 57-1138099
Total Assets: $13,172,012
EGA Member*: No
Board Members: Vincent McGee – Chair, Tuti B. Scott – Vice Chair, Noa Emmett Aluli, Kafi D. Blumenfield, Joanie Bronfman, Stephanie J. Clohesy, Michael Fernandez, Jacob Hunter Fisher, Lisa Hall, Peter Mellen, Suzanne Nossel, John A. Powell, Chuck C. Savitt

Tides Center
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity

* Note: The Environmental Grantmakers Association does not disclose their membership list, so information included in this appendix is based on the best available information.
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 94-3213100
Total Assets: $72,150,699
EGA Member*: No
Function: Fiscal Sponsor
Board Members: Stephanie Clohesy – Chair, Tuti Scott, John Powell, Suzanne Nossel, Michael Fernandez

**Tides Foundation**
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: San Francisco, CA
EIN: 51-0198509
Total Assets: $141,039,613
EGA Member*: Yes
Board Members: Joanie Bronfman – Chair, Lisa Hall, Vincent McGee, Chuck Savitt, Jacob Fisher, Kafi Blumenfield

**Virginia Organizing**
Status: 501(c)(3) Public Charity
Registered: Charlottesville, VA
EIN: 54-1674992
Total Assets: $2,888,732
EGA Member*: No
Function: Fiscal Sponsor
Board Members: Sandra Cook – Chairperson, D. Ladelle McWhorter, Vice-Chairperson, Thomasine Wilson – Secretary, Denise Smith – At-Large Executive Committee Member, Janice “Jay” Johnson – Treasurer, Debra Grant, Gabrielle Brown, Janie Williams, Johnny Mayo, Ray Scher

---

446 Tides Center, IRS Form 990, 2012.
448 Tides Found., IRS Form 990, 2012.
450 Virginia Organizing, IRS Form 990, 2012.

* Note: The Environmental Grantmakers Association does not disclose their membership list, so information included in this appendix is based on the best available information.
APPENDIX B: ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

American Lung Association (ALA)
Type: 501(c)(3)
Total Assets: $31,049,040
Board Members: Kathryn A. Forbes, Chair; John F. Emanuel, Vice Chair; Penny J. Siewart, Secretary/Treasurer; Ross P. Lanzafame, Past Chair; Linn Billingsley, Michael F. Busk, Cheryl A. Calhoun, Chris Carney, Michael V. Carstens, Mario Castro, Arthur A. Cerullo, Pauline Grant; Sumita Khatri; Angela V. Mastrofrancesco; Robert Merchant; Stephen J. Nolan; Stephen R. O’Kane; Harry Perlstadt; Austin K. Pugh; Jane Z. Reardon; Jeffrey T. Stein; Karin A. Tollefson; Leticia W. Towns
Executive Leadership: Harold Wimmer, President and CEO
Membership Dues: None

Center for Biological Diversity (CBD)
Type: 501(c)(3)
Total Assets: $12,282,335
Board Members: Marcey Olajos, Board Chair; Stephanie Zill, Treasurer; Matt Frankell Peter Galvin; Todd Steiner; Todd Schulke (on the Founders Advisory Board); Dr. Robin Silver (on the Founders Advisory Board)
Executive Leadership: Kierán Suckling, Executive Director and Cofounder; Michael Finkelstein, Director of Operations and Secretary; Marcy Brell, Chief Financial Officer; Judy Anderson, Bookkeeper; John Buse, Legal Director, Interim General Counsel; Peter Galvin, Director of Programs and Cofounder; Gus Glaser, Executive Assistant; Trish Mallon, Human Resources Director; Rebecca O'Sullivan, Regional Office Manager; Linda Wells, Director of Finance
Membership Dues: An amount greater than 0 (suggested $35) must be donated when you sign up. It is tax-deductible.
Party Affiliation: “Whereas [CBD], we’re truly nonpartisan. It’s not because we have some naïve concept of nonpartisanship. It’s that the Democratic Party is not adequately looking after the needs of nature, and therefore it’s counterproductive to completely ally with them.”
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452 American Lung Association, IRS Form 990 (2012).
454 Center for Biological Diversity, IRS Form 990 (2012).
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)
Type: 501(c)(3)458
Total Assets: $208,751,208459
Board of Trustees: Carl Ferenbach, Chair; Arthur Kern, Vice Chair; Art Cooley, Secretary; G. Leonard Baker, Jr.; Abby Leigh; Michael Bills; Sarah Liao Sau-tung, Ph.D.; Sally G. Bingham, M.Div.; Katherine Lorenz, Shelby W. Bonnie; William K. Bowes, Jr.; Frank Loy; Dr. Jane Lubchenco; Keith Campbell; Leslie Dach; Susan Mandel; Kathryn Murdoch; Signe Ostby; Ann Doerr; Stephen W. Pacala, Ph.D.; Susan Ford Dorsey; Stephen W. Pacala, Ph.D.; Stanley Druckenmiller; Robert M. Perkowitz; Kirsten J. Feldman; Lynn R. Goldman, M.D., M.P.H.; Julian H. Robertson, Jr.; Peggy M. Shepard; Charles J. Hamilton, Jr.; Griffith R. Harsh, IV, M.D., M.B.A; Douglas W. Shorenstein; Edward Stern; Mark W. Heising; Sam Rawlings Walton; Kristine Johnson; Charles F. Wurster, Ph.D.; The Honorable Thomas H. Kean; Richard J. Lazarus; Roland C. Clement (Honorary); Gene E. Likens, Ph.D. (Honorary); George G. Montgomery, Jr.(Honorary); N. J. Nicholas, Jr.(Honorary); George M. Woodwell, Ph.D. (Honorary)460
Executive Leadership: Fred Krupp, President; Lisa Henshaw, COO; Paula Hayes, Senior VP Global Strategic Initiatives; Eric Pooley, Senior VP Strategy and Communications; Linda Nelson, Senior VP Development; Cynthia Hallenbeck, Chief Financial Officer, Brian Attas, CIO; Felipa Bernard, VP Human Resources; Cynthia Hampton, VP Marketing & Communications; Carol Kinzler, Chief of Staff461
Membership Dues: A donation is required when you sign up to be a member (suggested amount $25). It is tax-deductible.
Party Affiliation: Nonpartisan. “Working for smart, nonpartisan policy. We have always worked to be a trusted force for environmental progress, on both sides of the aisle”462

Environmental Defense Action Fund
Type: 501(c)(4)463
Total Assets: $208,751,208464
Board of Directors: Frank Loy, Co-chair; William R. Goodell, Co-chair; Brian Conboy; Thomas F. Darden, II; Richard H. Davis; Kirsten J. Feldman; Carl Ferenbach; Charles J. Hamilton, Jr.; Coddy Johnson; Derek Kan; The Honorable Thomas H. Kean; John C. Kerr; Abby Leigh; Susan Mandel; Adele

459 Environmental Defense Fund, IRS Form 990 (2012).
464 Environmental Defense Action Fund, IRS Form 990 (2012).
Simmons; Nina Szlosberg-Landis; Sam Rawlings Walton; Jeffrey P. Williams; Paul Junger Witt; Joanne Witty

Executive Leadership: Elizabeth B. Thompson, President; Fred Krupp, Executive Director; Joe Bonfiglio, Deputy Director; Cynthia Hallenbeck, Treasurer

**Greenpeace Fund**
Type: 501(c)(3)\(^467\)
Total Assets: $15,313,140\(^468\)
Board of Directors: Tom Newark, Chair; Jeffrey Hollender, Director; Elizabeth Gilchrist, Director; Ainhoa Ladha, Director; Adelaide Gomer, Director; Ellen McPeake, Director; John Passacantando, Director\(^469\)
Executive Leadership: Kumi Naidoo, Greenpeace International Executive Director; Annie Leonard, Greenpeace USA Executive Director; Britt Coçanour, Director of Public Outreach; Nicky Davies, Campaigns Director
Membership Dues: No set dues; membership by monthly or single donations; no revenue from membership dues listed on 990
Party Affiliation: “Greenpeace is a force for hope and you can help us shine that light much brighter. We are independent and non-partisan.”\(^471\)

**Greenpeace Inc.**
Type: 501(c)(4)\(^472\)
Total Assets: $5,121,059\(^473\)
Board of Directors: Karen Topakian, Chair; Guillermo Quinteros, Director; Jee Kim, Director; Bryony Schwan, Director; Larry Kopald, Director; Tracy Sturdivant, Director; Betsy Taylor, Director\(^474\)
Executive Leadership: Kumi Naidoo, Greenpeace International Executive Director; Annie Leonard, Greenpeace USA Executive Director; Britt Coçanour, Director of Public Outreach; Nicky Davies, Campaigns Director
Membership Dues: No set dues; membership by monthly or single donations; no revenue from membership dues listed on 990\(^476\)
Party Affiliation: “Greenpeace, Inc. is the leading independent campaigning organization…”\(^477\)

---

\(^466\) Id.
\(^467\) Greenpeace Fund, IRS Form 990, 2013.
\(^468\) Greenpeace Fund, IRS Form 990, 2012.
\(^473\) Greepeace, IRS Form 990 (2012).
\(^475\) Id.
\(^476\) Id.
\(^477\) Id.
League of Conservation Voters Education Fund
Type: 501 (c)(3)\textsuperscript{478}
Total Assets: $7,545,946\textsuperscript{479}
Board of Directors: Carol Browner, Chair; Laura Turner Seydel, Vice Chair; Sarah Rose, Secretary; Tom Kiernan, Treasurer; Ruth Hennig; Ian Inaba; Bill Roberts; Tom Steinbach; Anne Summers; Lisa Wozniak\textsuperscript{480}
Executive Leadership: Gene Karpinski, President; Patrick Collins, Senior Vice President, Finance & Administration; Stacey Folsom, Senior Vice President, Development; Tiernan Sittenfeld, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs; Rich Thomas, General Counsel & Senior Vice President; David Willett, Vice President, Communications; Vinnie Wishrad, Senior Vice President, Membership and Online Engagement; Ed Zuckerman, Senior Vice President, State Capacity Building
Party Affiliation: “An independent, non-partisan 501(c)(3) organization, LCV Education Fund was founded in 1985 to provide research and training on environmental issues.”\textsuperscript{482}

League of Conservation Voters
Type: 501(c)(4)\textsuperscript{483}
Total Assets: $8,074,139\textsuperscript{484}
Board of Directors: Carol Browner, Chair; Sherwood Boehlert, Vice Chair; Marcia Bystryn, Secretary; Tom Kiernan, Treasurer; Theodore Roosevelt IV (Honorary Chair); John H. Adams; Paul Austin; Brent Blackwelder (Honorary); Brendon Cechovic; Carrie Clark; Manny Diaz; George T. Frampton, Jr.; Wade Greene (Honorary); Rampa R. Hormel; John Hunting (Honorary); Winsome McIntosh (Honorary); Mark Magaña; Peter Mandelstam; Pete Maysmith; William H. Meadows III; Reuben Munger; Bill Roberts; Larry Rockefeller; Laura Turner Seydel; Trip Van Noppen; Kathleen Welch\textsuperscript{485}
Executive Leadership: Gene Karpinski, President; Patrick Collins, Senior Vice President, Finance & Administration; Stacey Folsom, Senior Vice President, Development; Tiernan Sittenfeld, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs; Rich Thomas, General Counsel & Senior Vice President; David Willett, Vice President, Communications; Vinnie Wishrad, Senior Vice

\textsuperscript{479} League of Conservation Voters Education Fund, IRS Form 990 (2012).
\textsuperscript{482} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{483} League of Conservation Voters, IRS Form 990, 2012.
\textsuperscript{484} League of Conservation Voters, IRS Form 990 (2012).
Membership Dues: A donation is required when you sign up (suggest amount $35). It is not tax-deductible.

Party Affiliation: There is no mention of any partisan affiliation or nonpartisan affiliation.

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Type: 501(c)(3)
Total Assets: $268,165,564

Board of Trustees: Daniel R. Tishman, Chair; Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr., Chair Emeritus; Patricia Bauman, Vice Chair; Alan F. Horn, Vice Chair; Wendy K. Neu, Vice Chair; Mary Moran, Treasurer; John H. Adams; Adam Albright; Richard E. Ayres; Claire Bernard; Anna Scott Carter; Sarah E. Cogan; Laurie David; Leonardo DiCaprio; John E. Echohawk; Michel Gelobter, Ph.D.; Kate Greswold; Arjun Gupta; Philip B. Korsant; Nicole E. Lederer; Michael Lynton; Shelly B. Malkin; Josephine A. Merck; Kelly Chapman Meyer; Peter A. Morton; Frederica P. Perera, Ph.D.; Robert Redford; Laurence Rockefeller; Jonathan F. P. Rose; Tom Roush, M.D.; William H. Schlesinger; Wendy Schmidt; Max Stone; James Taylor; Gerald Torres; David C. Vladeck; David F. Welch, Ph.D.; Eric Wepsic; George M. Woodwell, Ph.D.

Executive Leadership: Francis Beinecke, President; Peter Lehner, Exec Director; Lisa Benenson, Chief Communications Officer; Mitchell Bernar, Director of Litigation; Sarah Gillman, CFO; Ashok Gupta, Director of Programs; Francesca Koe, Director of Campaigns; Henry L. Henderson, Director, Chicago, Midwest Program; Annie Notthoff, Director, California Advocacy, San Francisco and Sacramento, Government Affairs Program

Membership Dues: Requires a donation amount (suggested $25) when you sign up. It is tax-deductible. However, when you join the Action Fund there is no fee.

Party Affiliation: There is no mention of any partisan affiliation or nonpartisan affiliation.

---

488 Id.
490 Natural Resources Defense Council, IRS Form 990 (2012).
National Wildlife Federation (NWF)
Type: 501(c)(3)\(^{495}\)
Total Assets: $66,456,891\(^{496}\)
Board of Directors: Deborah Spalding, Chair; Bruce Wallace, Chair Elect; Paul Beaudette, Eastern Vice Chair; Clark Bullard, Central Vice Chair; Kent Salazar, Western Vice Chair; Stephen K. Allinger, Past Chair; Brian Bashore, Director; Tahlia Bear, Director; Jenny Brock, Director; Alison Byers, Director; Ron Clausen, Director; Shelley Cohen, Director; Sharon Darnov, Director; Dianne Dillon-Ridgley, Director; Tom Dougherty, Director; John Grant, Jr., Director; David L. Hargett, Director; Bill Houston, Director; David Langhorst, Director; Jerry Little, Director; Ramon Lopez, Director; Brian Preston, Director; Julia Reed Zaic, Director; Norm Ritchie, Director; Truman Semans, Director; Leslie Shad, Director; Mary Van Kerrebrook, Director; Lise Van Susteren, Director; Nicole Wood, Director\(^{497}\)
Executive Leadership: Collin O’Mara, President & Executive Officer; Jaime Matyas, Executive VP and COO; Deborah Spalding, Chair\(^{498}\)
Membership Dues: Must make a donation, suggest amount is $30. It is tax-deductible.\(^{499}\)
Party Affiliation: There is no mention of any partisan affiliation or nonpartisan affiliation.\(^{500}\)

National Wildlife Federation (NWF) Action Fund
Type: 501(c)(4)\(^{501}\)
Total Assets: $604,386\(^{502}\)
Executive Leadership/Board Members: Andy Buchsbaum served as interim Executive Director in 2013\(^{503}\). However, there is no information about who is the 2014 Executive Director.

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) Action Fund
Type: 501 (c)(4)\(^{504}\)
Total Assets: $2,955,590\(^{505}\)
Mission: “The NRDC Action Fund’s mission is to achieve the passage of legislation that jump-
starts the clean energy economy, reduces pollution, and sustains vibrant communities for all Americans. Now is the time for leadership and action from our elected officials — our current goal is a comprehensive clean energy policy that will repower our economy and fuel our future.”

Board of Directors: Bob Epstein, Chair; Wendy Abrams; John Adams; Christopher Arndt; Richard Ayres; Anne Bartley; Patricia Bauman; Frances Beinecke; Lucy Blake; Dayna Bochco; Sherwood Boehlert; Hamilton (Hal) Candee; Ari Emanuel; Michael Finnegan; William (Bill) Haney; Barbarina Heyerdahl; Cindy Harrell Horn; Jo Ann Kaplan; Hamilton F. Kean; Vernice Miller-Travis; Mary Moran; Edward James Olmos; Patricia Sullivan; Daniel R. Tishman; Eric Wepsic; Ira Ziering

Executive Leadership: Frances Beinecke, Action Fund President; Peter Lehner, Action Fund Executive Director; Wesley Warren, Director of Programs; David Goldston, Director of Government Affairs; Sarah Gillman, Treasurer; Heather Taylor-Miesle, Action Fund Director; Melissa Harrison, Communications Director; Steve VanLandingham, Development Director; Emily Bischof, Operations Coordinator; Chelsea Phipps, Program

Sierra Club Foundation
Type: 501(c)(3)
Total Assets: $98,974,748
Board of Directors: Larry Keeshan, Chair; Marni McKinney, Vice Chair; Steven Barkenfeld, Vice Chair; Tim Ryan, Treasurer; Sanjay Ranchod, Secretary; Molly O. Ross, Officer at Large; Geeta Aiyer; Peter Cartwright; Allison Chin; Susan Heitman; Lynn Jurich; Juan Martinez; Michael Ortiz; Mike Richter; Dan Shugar; Doug Walker; Marc Weiss; Shirley Weese Young

Executive Leadership: Peter Martin, Executive Director; Ginny Quick, Chief Financial Officer; Henry Holmes, Grants and Compliance Director; Brian Kavanagh, Senior Accountant; Jennie Palmer, Manager of Administration and Board Relations; Jessica Hulce, Grants and Compliance Manager; Naomi Reed, Bookkeeper; Ting Lee, Administrative Assistant.

Party Affiliation: “The Sierra Club Foundation cannot engage in or support partisan political activity.”

Sierra Club
Type: 501(c)(4)

506 Id.
512 Sierra Club, IRS Form 990 (2012).
Total Assets: $79,578,841

Board of Directors: David A. Scott, President, 2015; Spencer Black, Vice President, 2015; Lane E. Boldman, Secretary, 2015; Loren Blackford, Treasurer, 2017; Susana Reyes, Fifth Officer, 2016; Donna Buell, 2016; Michael Dorsey, 2017; Jim Dougherty, 2016; Charles Frank, 2016; Jessica Helm, 2017; Aaron Mair, 2017; Robin Mann, 2016; Dean Wallraff, 2017; Liz Walsh, 2015; Chris Warshaw, 2015.

Executive Leadership: Michael Brune, Executive Director.

Membership Dues: When you become a member they require you to give a “gift” of a certain amount ($15 is suggested but you can give lower than that). After that they charge you $7.50 for the magazine and $1.00 for the newsletter. It is noted on the website that this amount is included in a members dues. Not tax-deductible.

Party Affiliation: There is no mention of any partisan affiliation or nonpartisan affiliation.

Union of Concerned Scientists

Type: 501(c)(3)

Total Assets: $8,195,448

Board Members: James J. McCarthy, Chair; Peter A. Bradford, Vice-Chair; James S. Hoyte, Treasurer; Thomas H. Stone, Secretary; James A. Fay, Board Member Emeritus; Kurt Gottfried, Board Chair Emeritus; Richard L. Garwin; Andrew Gunther; Geoffrey Heal; Anne R. Kapuscinski; Mario J. Molina; Stuart L. Pimm; Lou Salkind; Adele Simmons; Nancy Stephens; Ellyn R. Weiss

Executive Leadership: Kenneth Kimmell, President; Kathleen Rest, Executive Director; Peter Frumhoff, Director of Science & Policy; Alden Meyer, Director of Strategy & Policy; Suzanne Shaw, Director of Communications; Laurie Marden, Chief Development Officer; Cheryl Schaffer, Chief Administrative and Financial Officer.

Membership Dues: New members must give a gift of $5 or more (suggested $25). It is tax-deductible.

513 Sierra Club IRS Form 990 (2012).
517 Id.
519 Union of Concerned Scientists, IRS Form 990 (2012).
Party Affiliation: Says it is a “reliable source for independent scientific analysis.” It does not explicitly state that the nonprofit is nonpartisan.\textsuperscript{523}

**U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) Education Fund**

Type: 501(c)(3)\textsuperscript{524}

Total Assets: $6,935,903\textsuperscript{525}

Executive Leadership: Andre Delattre, Executive Director; Steve Blackledge, Deputy Director; Allison Cairo, Deputy Director; Ed Mierzwinski, Consumer Program Director; Michael Russo, Federal Program Director; Chris Lindstrom, Higher Education Program Director; Meghan Hess, Associate Federal Field Director; Naomi Roth, Field Director\textsuperscript{526}

Party Affiliation: “United States Public Interest Research Group Education Fund, Inc. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.”\textsuperscript{527}

**U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Inc. (PIRG)**

Type: 501(c)(4)\textsuperscript{528}

Total Assets: $5,434,433\textsuperscript{529}

Board Members: Douglas H. Phelps, President and Chairman\textsuperscript{530}

Executive Leadership: Andre Delattre, Executive Director; Steve Blackledge, Deputy Director; Allison Cairo, Deputy Director\textsuperscript{531}

Party Affiliation: “The United States Public Interest Research Group, Inc. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization.”\textsuperscript{532}

**WildEarth Guardians**

Type: 501(c)(3)\textsuperscript{533}

Total Assets: $1,840,797\textsuperscript{534}

\textsuperscript{523} Id.
\textsuperscript{525} U.S. PIRG Education Fund IRS Form 990 (2011).
\textsuperscript{527} U.S. PIRG, Contribute to the U.S. PIRG Education Fund, https://secure2.roisolutions.net/enterprise/donatenow?client=FUND&page=2770&__utma=1.807164658.1406216801.1406216801.1&__utmb=1.14.10.1406216801&__utmz=1&__utmx=-
&__utmz=1.1406216801.1.utmcsr=(direct)utmccn=(direct)utmcmd=(none)&__utmv=-&__utmz=241001731 (last visited July 28, 2014).
\textsuperscript{528} U.S. Public Interest Research Group, IRS Form 990, 2012.
\textsuperscript{529} U.S. PIRG IRS Form 990 (2011).
\textsuperscript{532} U.S. PIRG, Become a Member of U.S. PIRG, https://secure2.roisolutions.net/enterprise/donatenow?client=FUND&page=2495&__utma=1.1061420184.1406216801.1.1406216801.1&__utmb=1.100.10.1406216801&__utmz=1&__utmx=-
&__utmz=1.1406216801.1.utmcsr=google|utmccn=(organic)utmcmd=organic|utmcrt=(not%20provided)&__utmv=-&__utmk=232076063 (last visited July 28, 2014).
Board of Directors: Robin Smith, President; Peter Schoenburg, Vice President; Todd Ringler, Secretary; Shannon Larsen, Treasurer; Jess Alford, Director; Cathy Bailey, Director; Nat Cobb, Director; Marion Hourdequin, Director; Janet McHard, Director; Mimsi Milton, Director; Brett Paben, Director; Jon Spar, Director; Bill Syme, Director; David Will, Director.

Executive Leadership: John Horning, Executive Director; Carol Norton, Associate Director; Bryan Bird, Wild Places Program Director; Lori Colt, Communication Director; Bethany Cotton, Wildlife Program Director; Kevin Gaither-Banchoff, Development Director; Jim Matison, Restoration Director; Erik Molvar, Sagebrush Sea Campaign Director; Jeremy Nichols, Climate and Energy Program Director; Jen Pelz, Wild Rivers Program Director; Jodie Wheeler, Finance Director.

Membership Dues: $35/individual, $50/family.

Party Affiliation: No mention of any partisan or nonpartisan affiliation.

350.org
Type: 501(c)(3)
Total Assets: $3,127,221
Board Members: Bill McKibben, President, Co-founder, and Board Chair; Jay Halfon, Treasurer; K.C. Golden, Secretary; Melina Laboucan Massimo; Naomi Klein; Jessy Tolkan

Executive Leadership: May Boeve, Executive Director; Phil Aroneanu, U.S. Managing Director and NRDC Co-Founder; Samantha Bailey, Global Organizing Director; Will Bates, Global Campaigns Director and Co-Founder; Rikimah Glymph, Human Resources Director; Jamie Henn, Strategy and Communications Director and Co-Founder; Jason Kowalski, U.S. Policy Director; Matt Leonard, Director of Special Projects; Payal Parekh, Global Managing Director; Jon Warnow, Digital Director.

Membership Dues: No charge to join. Requests email, city, and country.

Party Affiliation: Non-partisan.

350.org Action Fund
Type: 501(c)(4)
Total Assets: $331,289

---

534 WildEarth Guardians, IRS Form 990 (2012).
537 Id.
538 Id.
540 350.org IRS Form 990 (2011).
543 Id.
Board Members: Betsy Taylor, President; Jessy Tolkam, Secretary; Bill McKibben, Treasurer\(^\text{547}\)

Executive Leadership: May Boeve, Executive Director and Co-Founder; Phil Aroneanu, U.S. Campaign Director and Co-Founder; Jamie Henn, Communications Director and Co-Founder; Jason Kowalski, Policy Director; Jeremy Osborn, Operations Director and Co-Founder; Jon Warnow, Web Director and Co-Founder\(^\text{548}\)

\(^{546}\) 350.org Action Fund IRS Form 990 (2011).
