

The Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources Is Set To Hear The Testimony Of A Fossil-Fuel Funded Writer Who Has Made A Career Out Of Blaming Renewables For Energy Problems.

SUMMARY: Senate Committee on Energy & Natural Resources hearing on “domestic and international energy price trends” to “examine the causes, outlook, and implications of domestic and international energy price trends.” Ranking Member has spent substantial time recently complaining about high retail gasoline prices, blaming them on President Biden. Barrasso had a more nuanced view of gasoline prices during the Bush Administration, when he said high costs were primarily a result of supply and demand.

The committee has invited writer Robert Bryce to testify. Bryce spent years dismissing green solutions to climate change and pushing fossil fuels, arguing renewables and electric vehicles will drive up costs and fail to meet energy needs. To make this argument, Bryce praises fossil fuels while ignoring contradicting claims and rejecting solutions on their face.

Bryce will be representing fossil fuel interests and dismissing the research of his fellow witness, International Energy Agency (IEA) Chief Energy Economist Tim Gould. IEA’s recent research poses models refuting Bryce’s pro-oil and gas arguments while proposing solutions to climate change that differ from Bryce blanket panning of non-nuclear renewables.

Senators Barrasso Says High Gasoline Prices Are President Biden’s Fault, But Had A More Nuanced View When Prices Spiked During The Bush Administration.

Senator John Barrasso Blames The High Retail Price Of Gasoline On President Joe Biden, But When Prices Spiked Under President Bush He Thought The Issue Was More Nuanced

Today, Senator Barrasso Claims Biden Policies Result In Higher Gasoline Prices For His Constituents

Barrasso: “Is It Any Wonder We’re Seeing Surging Fuel Prices And Inflation? The President’s Desire To Spend Without Limit Is Driving Inflation To Levels That Punish Most Working Families.” “Is it any wonder we’re seeing surging fuel prices and inflation? The president’s desire to spend without limit is driving inflation to levels that punish most working families. April saw the highest inflation rate in over a decade.” [Fox News, [07/02/21](#)]

Barrasso: “While Americans Are Paying Sky High Prices At The Pump, The Biden Administration Has Its Head In The Sand.” “While Americans are paying sky high prices at the pump, the Biden Administration has its head in the sand. Begging OPEC and Russia to produce more isn’t an energy policy, its surrender.” [Twitter, [10/12/21](#)]

Barrasso: “Everybody Is Paying Higher Prices Today For Gas And Groceries Compared To The Day Joe Biden Came Into Office.” “People are feeling the pain of this administration and

inflation. Everybody is paying higher prices today for gas and groceries compared to the day Joe Biden came into office. Inflation will only get worse if the Democrats pass this reckless tax and spending bill." [Twitter, [10/05/21](#)]

Barrasso: "Americans Are Concerned About The Fact That When They Go To Fill Up For A Tank Of Gas It Costs Significantly More Than It Did When Joe Biden Came To Office."
"Americans are concerned about the fact that when they go to fill up for a tank of gas it costs significantly more than it did when Joe Biden came to office. Instead of addressing this, @POTUS is in Scotland apologizing for America and wants to raise the cost of American energy." [Twitter, [11/02/21](#)]

But In 2008, When George Bush Was President, Barrasso Said Gasoline Was Expensive Because Of "Supply And Demand"

2008: Barrasso Claimed High Prices In 2008 Were "Primarily Due To Supply And Demand Fundamentals." "Today's current oil prices are primarily due to supply and demand fundamentals. At close examination, there are really several different underlying contributors to today's high prices: rising world demand, especially in India and China; geopolitical tensions in the Middle East, in Venezuela, in Nigeria; limited options for acquiring additional supply; the weakness of the U.S. dollar; environmental regulations; and perhaps even excessive market speculation and manipulation. Recognizing this, Federal Government practices should not--should not--drive prices even higher. That is why I am announcing legislation today, S. 2927, that provides for a temporary suspension of Federal oil purchases for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve." [Votesmart.org, [04/29/08](#)]

2008: Barrasso Called On Congress To Consider Both Short And Long-Term Proposals To Curb High Oil Prices. "Barrasso's comments came during a Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing to examine the influence of speculation and institutional investors on the price of oil. 'Oil rich nations should not be bidding up the price of future oil contracts at the expense of American consumers. We need to examine ways to prevent excessive speculation and market manipulation.' Barrasso called on Congress to consider both short and long-term proposals to curb high oil prices. He noted that changing the way the federal government buys oil for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve warrants revision. He urged that a comprehensive solution must incorporate a vision for the future and expanded domestic production. 'We must find ways to be more energy independent,' Barrasso added. 'We need all of our nation's traditional energy sources, and Wyoming's coal is an important part of that.'" [Congressional Documents and Publications, 04/04/08]

Robert Bryce Is A Writer Who Has Made A Career Out Of Rejecting Green Energy Solutions While Working For The Climate Denying Manhattan Institute.

The Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources Is Holding A Hearing Regarding Energy Prices Trends On November 16, 2021.

On November 16, 2021, The Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources Plans To Hold A Hearing On The “Causes, Outlook, And Implications” Of Current Energy Price Trends. “The purpose of the hearing is to examine the causes, outlook, and implications of domestic and international energy price trends.” [Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources, Hearings And Business Meetings, accessed [11/10/21](#)]

The Witnesses Include:

- Stephen Nalley, Acting Administration of the US Energy Information Administration (EIA)
- Tim Gould, Chief Energy Economist at the International Energy Agency (IEA)
- Robert Bryce, an author, journal, podcaster, and film producer

Robert Bryce Is A Writer Who Has Worked At The Fossil Fuel-Funded Manhattan Institute Pushing For Oil And Gas Usage.

Robert Bryce Is A “Author, Journalist, Podcaster, And Film Producer.” [Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources, Hearings And Business Meetings, accessed [11/10/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Was A Senior Fellow At The Manhattan Institute From 2010 To 2019. [LinkedIn, Robert Bryce, accessed [11/10/21](#)]

- **The Manhattan Project Has A History Of Promoting Fossil Fuels And Downplaying Climate Science While Taking In Money From Exxon Mobil And The Koch Brothers.** “Among the most frequent op-ed contributors is Robert Bryce, a senior fellow with the Manhattan Institute, a think tank that has made promoting fossil fuels and downplaying climate change a central focus – and that has received \$1.21 million in funding from the likes of ExxonMobil and Claude R. Lambe, a Koch-owned charitable organization.” [Mother Jones, [12/13/12](#)]

Robert Bryce Blames Energy Price Increases And Blackouts On The Transition To Renewables.

Robert Bryce Blamed Europe’s Energy Problems On Its Push For Renewables, Arguing Biden’s Efforts To Pursue Renewable Energy Would Lead The US Down The Same Path. “If Washington policymakers want to see what happens when you push renewable-energy mandates too far, too fast, they only need to read the news stories coming out of Europe. [...] Indeed, energy poverty, soaring energy prices, industrial shutdowns, and a surge in coal use are the obvious results of Europe’s rush to embrace renewables without considering how that rush would affect the affordability, resilience, and reliability of the region’s energy and power systems. [...] Despite these facts, the Biden administration and top Congressional Democrats have included the Clean Electricity Performance Program in the latest version of the multi-trillion infrastructure package now pending before Congress.” [Robert Bryce, [10/13/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Blamed Higher Energy Costs in California On Their Transition To Renewables. “Over the past decade or so, the state has steadily increased its renewable-electricity mandates. By 2030, the state’s electric utilities must be getting at least 60% of their electricity from renewables and they must be producing 100% “zero-carbon” electricity by 2045. The imposition

of these mandates has coincided with a dramatic increase in electricity prices.” [Robert Bryce, [07/14/20](#)]

Robert Bryce Claims The Biden’s Goal Of Decarbonizing The Electric Grid Will Increase Prices. “As a candidate, Joe Biden pledged to overhaul America’s electric grid so that it relies solely on “clean” electricity by 2035. As president, Biden will find that overhauling our most important and most complex energy network – and doing so in just 15 years – is easier said than done. Decarbonizing our continent-spanning electric grid will require grappling with four big challenges: cost, keeping nuclear plants open, replacing natural gas in the power sector, and the ongoing land-use conflicts over renewables. [...] Completely decarbonizing the electric grid will require spending trillions of dollars and those costs will be passed along to consumers in the form of higher electricity prices and/or higher taxes.” [Robert Bryce, [11/09/20](#)]

- **Bryce Claims Offshore Wind Increases Energy Prices For Consumers.** “The reason for the omission is obvious: President Biden’s offshore-wind scheme will be terrible for consumers. If those 30,000 megawatts of capacity get built – which, given the history of scuttled projects like Cape Wind, is far from a sure thing – that offshore juice will cost ratepayers billions of dollars more per year than if that same power were produced from onshore natural-gas plants or advanced nuclear reactors. [...] Thus, the electricity from 30,000 megawatts of offshore wind could cost consumers roughly \$7.6 billion more per year than if it came from advanced nuclear reactors and about \$11.1 billion more than if it were produced from gas-fired generators.” [Robert Bryce, [04/09/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Blamed “Banning Natural Gas” For Increased Energy Prices For Consumers. “Banning natural gas forces consumers to use more-expensive electricity to heat their homes, cook their food, and heat the water needed to wash their clothes and dishes. Proponents of the electrify everything push, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, which got \$100 million from the Bezos Earth Fund, prefer to call their efforts “beneficial electrification.” The more accurate term is “forced electrification” because it will increase the energy burden on low- and middle-income consumers.” [Robert Bryce, [03/19/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Blamed The Texas Blackouts, In Part, On The "Rush To Add Renewable Energy Sources."

Robert Bryce Blamed Dangerous And “Costly” Energy Blackouts Like The One In Texas, In Part, On Renewables. “Blackouts are deadly and create costly drags on the economy. Bad policies and lack of oversight contributed to the February blackouts in Texas. [...] Three things are weakening the grid. One is the rush to add renewable energy sources such as wind and solar, which depend on amenable weather to function. [...] Renewable energy promoters don’t want to admit that wind and solar are undermining the grid.” [Robert Bryce, [09/07/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Has Raved About Fossil Fuels And Questioned Climate Science.

Robert Bryce Expressed Doubts About Climate Science. “On the science of global climate change, I’m an agnostic. I’ve seen Al Gore’s movie, and I’ve read reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I’ve also listened to the ‘skeptics.’ I don’t know

who's right. Now that Gore has won the Nobel Peace Prize, it seems that – at least for now – the skeptics are losing the public-relations war. Whatever.” [*Austin Chronicle*, [12/07/07](#)]

Robert Price Praised Natural Gas As “The Best News To Hit The US Energy Scene [...] Since 1930.” “What we see -- and I had a piece in *The Wall Street Journal* earlier this week talking about this -- we're on the verge now of a U.S. renaissance in the industrial manufacturing sector. Why? Because of low- cost natural gas. This is the best news to hit the U.S. energy scene, in my view, since 1930, the discovery of the east Texas field, and yet the president continues to prattle on about clean energy and green energy, and so on, when the resurgence of manufacturing is really dependent on what's happening right now in oil and gas.” [*Fox Business, The Willis Report*, [06/17/11](#)]

In December, Bryce Is Slated To Speak Alongside Vocal Climate Denier Alex Epstein.

Robert Bryce Is Speaking Alongside Climate Change Denier Alex Epstein At An Upcoming World Petroleum Congress Event. “The 23rd World Petroleum Congress Organizing Committee is pleased to welcome acclaimed authors Alex Epstein and Robert Bryce to the already-robust Congress program. Mr. Epstein and Mr. Bryce will share their thoughts and knowledge in the session titled, Perception of the Energy Industry: Creating A Future Vision. This moderated discussion will focus on what must be done to address perception issues by analyzing the value the industry brings to the world and its formidable role in energy transition and building a sustainable energy future.” [*Hydrocarbon Processing*, [10/21/21](#)]

- **Alex Epstein Has Spread Climate Change Denial.** “If you've ever expressed the least bit of skepticism about environmentalist calls for making the vast majority of fossil fuel use illegal, you've probably heard the smug response: “97% of climate scientists agree with climate change” – which always carries the implication: Who are you to challenge them? The answer is: you are a thinking, independent individual--and you don't go by polls, let alone second-hand accounts of polls; you go by facts, logic and explanation.” [*Forbes*, [01/06/15](#)]

Robert Bryce Dismissed The International Energy Agency's Roadmap To Net-Zero Emissions As “Make-Believe.”

Robert Bryce Attacked IEA's Roadmap To Net-Zero Study As “Modeling Make-Believe.” “The latest example of this modeling make-believe was delivered last week by the International Energy Agency (IEA), which released a report that claims to provide a roadmap to achieving “net-zero” emissions by 2050. The IEA calls the report, “the world's first comprehensive study of how to transition to a net-zero energy system by 2050 while ensuring stable and affordable energy supplies, providing universal energy access, and enabling robust economic growth. It sets out a cost-effective and economically productive pathway” to a “resilient energy economy dominated by renewables like solar and wind instead of fossil fuels.”” [*Robert Bryce*, [05/25/21](#)]

Robert Bryce Complained That The Government Picks Favorites With Its Renewable Energy And Electric Vehicle Support...

Robert Bryce Claimed The Oil And Gas Industry Is Disadvantaged By Green Energy Subsidies. “Well, look, if I were energy secretary, I would say let’s have fair field, no favor. Let’s eliminate all subsidies and let all these different sources compete on their merits. But I think what the problem with the solar business -- and the Obama administration is being pilloried now for Solyndra, but in all of this, we have forgotten the issue of scale. The U.S. gets at least 7,000 times more energy from hydrocarbons as it does from all solar. So I think we’re paying attention largely to the wrong source right now.” [PBS NewsHour, [11/17/11](#)]

...Painting Fossil Fuels As The Losers Despite Their Billions In US Taxpayer-Funded Bailouts And Trillions In Subsidies Globally.

G20 Countries Gave \$3.3T In Direct Subsidies To Coal, Oil, And Gas From 2015 To 2019. “BloombergNEF, a research outfit, and Bloomberg Philanthropies, a charity, calculate that G20 countries offered direct subsidies on coal, oil, gas and fossil-fuel-fired power worth more than \$3.3trn between 2015 and 2019.” [The Economist, [10/30/21](#)]

- **The Fossil Fuel Industry Benefits From \$11M In Subsidies Every Minutes.** “The fossil fuel industry benefits from subsidies of \$11m every minute, according to analysis by the International Monetary Fund.” [The Guardian, [10/06/21](#)]

Oil And Gas Companies Got Billions In Tax Breaks And Taxpayer Funded Bailouts In 2020.

Oil, Gas, Mining, And Related Companies Took In Over \$4.5 Billion Through The Paycheck Protection Program (PPP). “In total, 22,382 oil, gas, mining and related extractive resource corporations received a staggering \$4,530,469,847 in taxpayer-funded monies through the PPP. In contrast, the wind and solar sector received a total of \$164,987,228, going to some 1,133 businesses. The average loan amount was nearly 40% higher for extractive resource corporations as well.” [Accountable.US, [12/11/20](#)]

- **About 70% Of The Entire Oil And Gas Sector Received Bailouts Through PPP.** “Data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics shows that 31,992 private oil, gas, and mining establishments are currently operating in the United States, meaning 70% of all the entire sector received a PPP bailout, up 8% from a previous analysis by Accountable.US. In total, a new report by Bailout Watch finds that the fossil fuel sector may have received upwards of \$15.2 billion from the Trump administration during the pandemic.” [Accountable.US, [12/11/20](#)]

Oil And Gas Companies Got \$1.9 Billion In Tax Breaks From The CARES Act During The Pandemic. [The Hill, [05/15/20](#)]

The Main Street Lending Program Gave \$828 Million In Bailouts To Oil And Gas Companies During COVID-19. “Forty-six fossil fuel companies have received Fed-subsidized loans totaling \$828 million since the program started in July. The average loan size, \$18 million, is nearly double the program’s average loan size of \$9.8 million, or \$9.2 million excluding fossil fuels. Twelve of the fossil fuel loans were worth \$35 million or more, accounting for more than

30% of the program's loans of that magnitude. See the full list of companies here." [Bailout Watch, [12/16/20](#)]

The Federal Reserve Has Used Pandemic Aid To Buy Over \$355M In Bonds Issued By Oil And Gas Companies. "The U.S. government has used emergency pandemic aid to purchase more than \$355 million in bonds issued by companies in the battered oil and gas industry, according to a report being released Wednesday by critics who say the investments amount to a bailout." [Bloomberg, [09/30/20](#)]

Increased Gas Prices Are Not Related To Individual Policy Decisions And Are Heavily Impacted By International Markets...

It Is "Extremely Unlikely" That Any One Political Decision Anywhere Could Materially Affect Oil Prices, "Marginal" Effects At Best. "But this vastly overstates a president's power to control the cost of a commodity traded on a world market. Although a president's actions — including Biden's climate policies — can nudge the price of oil, the effect is marginal at best, experts say. 'The scale of the global oil market,' said Pavel Molchanov, an oil analyst at Raymond James, "is so massive that it would be extremely unlikely for any single political decision, anywhere in the world, to materially affect oil prices." [Washington Post, [11/12/20](#)]

An Oil And Gas Economist Said Gas Prices Would Probably Not Change Much Due To Biden's Executive Order, As Prices Are Determined By Crude Oil Prices, Which Are Settled In The International Markets. "What effect could this order have on consumers? Could gas prices change? 'Probably not much,' according to [University Of Wyoming Oil And Gas Economist Chuck] Mason, the UW economist, said on Tuesday. 'Gasoline prices are determined by crude oil prices, and crude oil prices settle in the international markets. So having a five to 10% reduction in crude production, you will not be able to see the difference in international crude markets.'" [Casper Star-Tribune, [01/27/21](#)]

...And Current Prices Are Caused By Pandemic-Related Supply Changes And Weather-Related Supply Disruptions.

Tim Gould Noted That A Return Of Energy Demand And Emissions Is Due To A Failure To "Change The Structure Of Energy Demand." ""If you don't change direction, you will end where you were going," Tim Gould, IEA chief energy economist, said in an interview before the report's publication. "Unless you change the structure of energy demand, a recovery in economic activity was always likely to lead to the re-emergence of previous patterns of both energy demand and emissions."" [Bloomberg, [10/13/21](#)]

The IEA's Tim Gould Attributes Higher Oil And Gas Prices With The Economic Recovery Following The Pandemic Combined With Supply Disruptions Caused By A Long Winter. "Government climate policies and the transition away from fossil fuels are not to be blamed for the energy crisis ravaging Europe and Asia, according to the International Energy Agency. The surge in natural gas and oil prices is more a result of the economic recovery from the pandemic, which was met with a series of supply disruptions, a prolonged winter in Europe and a persistent drought in Brazil, IEA Chief Energy Economist Tim Gould said Wednesday during an Institute of International Finance event." [Bloomberg, [10/13/21](#)]

Stephen Nalley Attributed Higher Energy Prices With The Transition Out Of The “Pandemic-Related Economic Downturn.” ““As we have moved beyond what we expect to be the deepest part of the pandemic-related economic downturn, growth in energy demand has generally outpaced growth in supply,” EIA Acting Administrator Steve Nalley said in a statement. “These dynamics are raising energy prices around the world.” [S&P Global, [10/13/21](#)]

According To The Energy Information Agency (EIA), Heating Prices Are Anticipated To Increase Significantly Less For Electric Users Than Gas Users.

EIA’s Stephen Nalley Noted That Home Energy Bills Will Increase This Winter, But Noted That Electric Heat Spending Will Increase Only A Fraction As Much As Gas Heating. “According to the US Energy Information Administration, household spending on natural gas, the primary heating fuel for nearly half of all US houses, will average \$746 this winter, up 30% from last year. However, according to the agency, electricity spending, which is used to heat around 41% of homes, may climb by 6%. “Higher global and local energy costs, as a result of economies resuming growth, will translate into higher home energy bills this winter,” said Stephen Nalley, interim administrator of the EIA.” [Nature World News, [10/14/21](#)]

Tim Gould And The IEA Have Rejected Claims That The Energy Transition Has Increased Energy Prices.

Tim Gould Is The Chief Energy Economist At The International Energy Agency (IEA). [Senate Committee On Energy & Natural Resources, Hearings And Business Meetings, accessed [11/10/21](#)]

IEA’s Tim Gould Rejected The Claim That Current Energy Prices Were Related To A Green Energy Transition. “Tim Gould at the IEA says the current energy price spikes the world is facing, which are driven primarily by soaring gas prices, aren’t caused by a transition to cleaner energy.” [New Scientist, [10/13/21](#)]

The IEA Has Found That Renewables Are Necessary And Could Actually Insulate Consumers From Price Shocks, Saving Us Money Down The Line.

The IEA Argued More Investment In Green Energies Like Wind And Solar Are Needed To Combat Climate Change. “The world is failing to invest in energy on the scale needed to escape catastrophic climate change and avoid sharp increases in fossil fuel prices, the International Energy Agency warned. In a report just weeks before a key climate change summit known as COP26, the agency said that investment in green energy like solar and wind is falling short of what’s needed to keep the planet from warming up significantly.” [Bloomberg, [10/13/21](#)]

IEA Analysis Notes That An Energy Transition Could Protect From Energy Price Shocks. “In fact, the group’s analysis suggests that renewables, energy efficiency and electric cars may hold the answer to protecting against a repeat of today’s crisis. The IEA modelled a price shock in 2030, where coal, gas and oil prices reached the highest levels they hit in each region between 2010 and 2020. The group found it would be 30 per cent less costly for households in a scenario

where the world is on a trajectory to net zero by 2050 than a scenario similar to the path we are currently on." [*New Scientist*, [10/13/21](#)]

Gould Noted That The Energy Transition Would Have A Higher Upfront Cost, But Short Term Fuel Prices Would Matter Much Less. "One of the ways to think about the energy transition is a transition from a world in which fuel costs are extremely important in the short term – to produce energy and run other vital services – to one where you have to pay more in upfront expenditure to get certain things in place, whether that's an electric vehicle or wind farm or a solar panel, but then the operating costs are very low." [*Wall Street Journal*, [07/12/21](#)]

While The IEA Acknowledges That Renewables Are Not Currently Able To Meet Our Energy Needs Without Increased Investment, But Consider The Transition Possible Under Their Models.

The IEA Argues That Renewables Are Not Currently Able To Meet The Energy Gap, But Could Meet The Need With More Investment. "What we need to do is not to invest more in coal, oil and gas, but in order to cover the gap we have to invest in demand-side policies," Birol said, adding that this includes electrification, solar, wind and hydrogen. To put the world on a path towards net zero emissions by 2050, the IEA says investment in clean energy projects and infrastructure needs to more than triple over this decade, to nearly \$4 trillion/yr by 2030." [*Argus Media*, [10/13/21](#)]

Current Oil And Gas Spending Is Aligned With Energy Needs For The Remainder Of The Decade Under The IEA's Net-Zero Emissions Scenario That Calls For No Additional Oil And Gas Fields. "Current levels of upstream oil and gas spending are well-aligned with what would be needed for the remainder of this decade in the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 (NZE) scenario, which sees no need for new oil and gas fields beyond those already approved for development, according to Gould." [*Argus Media*, [10/13/21](#)]