

---

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MARYLAND  
No. 11, September Term, 2025

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*  
v.  
BP P.L.C., et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY  
No. 1293, September Term, 2024; MDEC: ACM-REG-1290-2024  
Cir. Ct. No. 24-C-18-004219; Honorable Videtta A. Brown, Presiding

---

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*  
v.  
BP P.L.C., et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY  
No. 2308, September Term, 2024; MDEC: ACM-REG-2308-2024  
Cir. Ct. No. C-02-CV-21-000565; Honorable Steven I. Platt, Senior Judge

---

CITY OF ANNAPOLIS,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*  
v.  
BP P.L.C., et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY  
No. 2309, September Term, 2024; MDEC: ACM-REG-2309-2024  
Cir. Ct. No. C-02-CV-21-000250; Honorable Steven I. Platt, Senior Judge

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* GENERAL (RETIRED) RICHARD B. MYERS  
and ADMIRAL (RETIRED) MICHAEL G. MULLEN,  
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES**

---

Cary Silverman (AIS #0012130282)  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
1800 K Street NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 783-8400  
csilverman@shb.com

Tristan L. Duncan  
(*pro hac vice* motion pending)  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550  
tlduncan@shb.com

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	5
ARGUMENT .....	9
I.    The Important National Security Interests in the Crosshairs of These Cases: A Historical Overview of the Federal Government’s Role in the Production and Sale of Oil and Gas .....	10
II.   The Federal Government’s Efforts to Ensure a Dependable, Abundant Supply of Oil and Gas Remain Essential to Its Conduct of Foreign Affairs and Military Preparedness .....	16
III.  Our Nation’s Vital Interests in Fuel Security and Managing Climate Change Cannot be Regulated by a Patchwork of State-Court Actions .....	18
CONCLUSION .....	21

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Conn.</i> , 564 U.S. 410 (2011) .....	7
<i>American Ins. Ass’n v. Garamendi</i> , 539 U.S. 396 (2003) .....	18-19
<i>Banco National de Cuba v. Sabbatino</i> , 376 U.S. 398 (1964).....	19
<i>Baltimore v. BP</i> , No. 24-C-18-004219, Mem. Op. and Order .....	19
<i>BMW of N. Am., Inc. v. Gore</i> , 517 U.S. 559 (1996) .....	8
<i>Bucks Cnty. v. BP P.L.C.</i> , No. 2024-01836, 2025 WL 1484203 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. May 16, 2025) .....	6
<i>California ex rel. Brown v. Watt</i> , 668 F.2d 1290 (D.C. Cir. 1981) .....	15
<i>City of Annapolis v. BP</i> , No. C-02-CV-000250, Mem. Op. and Order .....	7, 8
<i>City of New York v. Chevron Corp.</i> , 993 F.3d 81 (2d Cir. 2021).....	3, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. United States</i> , 2020 WL 5573048 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2020).....	5, 13
<i>Int’l Paper Co. v. Ouellette</i> , 479 U.S. 481 (1987) .....	8
<i>Kurns v. Railroad Friction Prods. Corp.</i> , 565 U.S. 625 (2012) .....	8
<i>North Carolina, ex rel. Cooper v. Tenn. Valley Auth.</i> , 615 F.3d 291 (4th Cir. 2010) .....	9
<i>Shell Oil Co. v. United States</i> , 751 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12
<i>Torres v. Texas Dep’t of Pub. Safety</i> , 597 U.S. 580 (2022) .....	18

<i>United States v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal.</i> , 332 U.S. 301 (1947) .....	9
---	---

## **Statutes**

43 U.S.C. § 1802 .....	15
Defense Production Act of 1950, Pub. L. No. 81-774.....	13
Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, 43 U.S.C. § 1332(3) .....	13, 14, 15, 16
Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973, Pub. L. No. 93-153, § 202(a), 87 Stat. 576, 584 (1973), Pub. L. No. 93-153 .....	14

## **Other Authorities**

Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, Pub. Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon (Jan. 30, 1974), <a href="https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=miua.4731948.1974.001&amp;seq=99">https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=miua.4731948.1974.001&amp;seq=99</a> .....	14
Def. Logistics Agency Energy, Fiscal Year 2019 Fact Book (2019), <a href="https://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/Energy/Publications/FactBookFiscalYear2019_highres.pdf?ver=2020-01-21-103755-473">https://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/Energy/Publications/FactBookFiscalYear2019_highres.pdf?ver=2020-01-21-103755-473</a> .....	17
Department of Energy, “Energy for the Warfighter: The Department of Defense Operational Energy Strategy,” June 14, 2011, <a href="https://www.energy.gov/articles/energy-war-fighter-department-defense-operational-energy-strategy">https://www.energy.gov/articles/energy-war-fighter-department-defense-operational-energy-strategy</a> .....	4
Energy Security Forum, Washington, D.C., 13 Oct. 2010, <a href="https://www.dvidshub.net/news/58040/mullen-military-has-strategic-imperative-save-resources">https://www.dvidshub.net/news/58040/mullen-military-has-strategic-imperative-save-resources</a> .....	8
H.R. Rep. No. 94-1084 (1976) .....	15
H.R. Rep. No. 95-590 (1977) .....	15
<i>Hearings Before Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Estimates Submitted by the Secretary of the Navy</i> , 64th Cong. 761 (1915) .....	10
Ian O. Lessor, <i>Resources and Strategy: Vital Materials in International Conflict 1600 – The Present</i> (1989).....	11
Jay Hakes, <i>A Declaration of Energy Independence</i> (2008) .....	13

Robert Harward, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy Retired, U.S. Climate Lawsuits Endanger Military and U.S. National Security Interests, <i>American Military News</i> (Apr. 20, 2023), <a href="https://americanmilitarynews.com/2023/04/u-s-climate-lawsuits-endanger-military-and-u-s-national-security-interests/">https://americanmilitarynews.com/2023/04/u-s-climate-lawsuits-endanger-military-and-u-s-national-security-interests/</a> .....	17
John W. Frey & H. Chandler Ide, <i>A History of the Petroleum Administration for War, 1941-1945</i> (1946) .....	12
National Petroleum Council, <i>A National Oil Policy for the United States</i> (1949) .....	12
Nixon Message, <i>N.Y. Times</i> , Apr. 19, 1973, <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/1973/04/19/archives/excerpts-from-nixon-message-developing-our-domestic-energy.html">https://www.nytimes.com/1973/04/19/archives/excerpts-from-nixon-message-developing-our-domestic-energy.html</a> .....	14, 15
President Barack Obama, Remarks on Energy at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland (Mar. 31, 2010), <a href="https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-energy-security-andrews-air-force-base-3312010">https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-energy-security-andrews-air-force-base-3312010</a> .....	16, 17
Press Secretary, White House Office of Communications, Statement on North Slope Oil Bill Signing (Nov. 28, 1995), 1995 WL 699656 .....	16
Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, S. Rep. No. 94-1, Pt. 1 (Jan. 17, 1975, 1st Sess.) .....	15
Special Message to the Congress on the Energy Crisis, Pub. Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, at 29 (Jan. 23, 1974), <a href="https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mia.4731948.1974.001&amp;seq=69">https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mia.4731948.1974.001&amp;seq=69</a> .....	14, 15
State of Delaware's Application for Certification of Interlocutory Appeal, <i>Delaware v. BP Am. Inc.</i> , No. N20C-09-097 (Del. Super. Ct., filed Jan. 19, 2024) .....	6, 7
Statement by President George W. Bush Upon Signing [H.R. 6111], Pub. Papers of the Presidents: George W. Bush, at 2217 (Dec. 20, 2006), <a href="https://books.google.com/books?id=o2ei8yOphboC&amp;printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&amp;q&amp;f=false">https://books.google.com/books?id=o2ei8yOphboC&amp;printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&amp;q&amp;f=false</a> .....	16
Statement of Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator of War, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, S. Res. 36 (Nov. 28, 1945) .....	11
Statement of Senator O'Mahoney, Chairman, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, S. Res. 36 (Nov. 28, 1945) .....	13

U.S. Energy Info. Admin., U.S. Energy Facts Explained (Apr. 27, 2020), <a href="https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/us-energy-facts/imports-and-exports.php">https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/us-energy-facts/imports-and-exports.php</a> .....	17
U.S. Gov't Accountability Off., GAO/RCED-87-75FS, Naval Petroleum Reserves: Oil Sales Procedures and Prices at Elk Hills, April Through December 1986 (1987), <a href="http://www.gao.gov/assets/90/87497.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/assets/90/87497.pdf</a> .....	10
Daniel Yergin, The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money & Power (1991).....	11

### **INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE<sup>1</sup>**

United States Air Force General (Retired) Richard B. Myers was appointed Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by President Clinton in 2000 and was appointed by President George W. Bush in 2001 to become the 15th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In that capacity, he served as the principal military advisor to the United States President, Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council. He served in that role until 2005. General Myers joined the Air Force in 1965 through the ROTC program at Kansas State University. He served in the Vietnam War and had over 600 combat flying hours in Vietnam. He has held numerous commands and served in significant staff positions in the Air Force. General Myers has received numerous awards and decorations for his service, including the Legion of Merit, the French Legion of Honor, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He received his fourth star in 1997 and retired from active duty in 2005, after more than forty years of active service. General Myers began serving as the Interim President of Kansas State University in late April 2016, and was announced as the permanent President on November 15, 2016. General Myers served as the 14th President of Kansas State University until his retirement on February 11, 2022.

United States Navy Admiral (Retired) Michael G. Mullen served as the 17th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 2007-2011 under both President Bush and President Obama. A graduate of the United States Naval Academy in 1968, Admiral Mullen served in the Vietnam War and commanded his first ship, the USS Noxubee, from

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties consented to the filing of this brief. No person, other than the *amici* or their attorneys, made a monetary contribution toward the preparation or submission of this brief.



1973-1975. He earned a Master's Degree in Operations Research in 1985 and, later that year, took command of the guided-missile destroyer USS Goldsborough. In 1991, Admiral Mullen participated in Harvard University's Advanced Executive Management graduate program. He was promoted to Rear Admiral in 1997 and, in 1998, was named Director of Surface Warfare in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO). Admiral Mullen is one of only four naval officers who has the distinction of receiving four, 4-Star assignments. In 2003, Admiral Mullen was named Vice Chief of Naval Operations and was tapped to head the United States Naval Forces in Europe and NATO's Joint Force Command in Naples. He then was appointed Chief of Naval Operations in 2005, and, in 2007, he was nominated by George W. Bush to be the 17th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Admiral Mullen retired from this position in 2011 after serving for four years under both a Republican and a Democratic president.

The focus of this brief is not on climate change policy. *Amici* express no view, and take no position, on climate change policy. They strongly believe these important national and international policy issues should be addressed consistently and uniformly via federal law, not adjudicated piecemeal across the country in a multitude of state courts applying differing state laws. Instead, this brief provides a history of the Federal Government's role in the production and sale of gasoline and diesel to ensure that the military is "deployment-ready." For more than a century, petroleum products have been, and currently are, essential for fueling the United States military around the world. In *amici's* view, the use of fossil fuels was crucial to the success of the armed forces when *amici* served as Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it remains crucial today.

In light of that concern, *amici* believe this extensive history and their practical experience demonstrate that these cases do not involve localized, intra-state interests that can be resolved through the application of state law. Rather, the causation and damages theories in these cases inextricably involve worldwide impacts and core federal interests. *City of New York v. Chevron Corp.*, 993 F.3d 81, 92 (2d Cir. 2021) (Plaintiffs seek to hold Appellees liable “for the effects of emissions made around the globe over the past several hundred years.”); E.41, E.70 (¶¶ 1, 39); E.668, E.711 (¶¶ 1, 50); E.1015, E.1059 (¶¶ 1, 49) (The Appellants here similarly allege that the “production and use of [the energy companies’] fossil fuel products create greenhouse gas pollution that warms the planet and changes our climate” and that “global warming” is “caused by [such] emissions,” for which they seek significant damages and abatement awards).

To be clear, it is not as though we believe anything having to do with climate change presents a national security concern. There are many lawsuits filed that may relate in some way to greenhouse gases, and we do not feel the need to weigh in on the vast majority of those lawsuits. However, these climate change cases are different. This subset of cases causes us concern because of both its sheer scope and its transparent attempt to substitute parochial judgments for those of the national, elected and appointed actors, to whom the Constitution commits domestic and international policymaking for this complex, multifaceted worldwide issue. Therefore, to assist the Court in understanding why these cases cause significant national security concerns, this brief first discusses the Federal Government’s—particularly the military’s—historical control and direction of Appellees’ production and sale of petroleum products.

The brief concludes with our perspective on the practical realities presented by these cases and the reasons we believe the lower court decisions should be affirmed. As former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff serving under both Democratic and Republican administrations and with over 80 years of combined service in the military, we can personally attest that petroleum products produced by companies like Appellees have been critical to national security, military preparedness, and combat missions. We are not alone in this belief. Military commanders, like General David Petraeus, universally emphasize that “[e]nergy is the lifeblood of our warfighting capabilities.”<sup>2</sup> To ensure the military has a dependable, abundant supply of the energy indispensable to our Nation’s warfighting capacity, this brief explains why, in our view, the climate change issues at the heart of these civil damages suits are matters for federal law, not state law.

While it is important to continue to look for “greener” ways to fuel the military, the reality is the U.S. military must always take into account its enemies’ own fossil fuel uses and potential superior deployment abilities because of those uses. The United States could go it alone and unilaterally strip itself of higher-performing fossil fuels, but that risks putting the Nation at a significant disadvantage. It would weaken our armed forces while relatively strengthening those of our adversaries. Stated differently, achieving energy security is a prerequisite for national security. Like how the reduction of nuclear weapons was achieved during and following the Cold War, a reduction in fossil-fuel use today can

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Department of Energy, “Energy for the Warfighter: The Department of Defense Operational Energy Strategy,” June 14, 2011, <https://www.energy.gov/articles/energy-war-fighter-department-defense-operational-energy-strategy>.

be accomplished only through comprehensive international, multi-lateral negotiations and treaties led by the Legislative and Executive branches, not through piecemeal litigation in various state courts.

### **INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT**

This case centers on the global sale and consumption of oil and gas products that are used by virtually every person on the planet every single day. Appellants seek to impose ruinous liability on Appellees due to their production and sale of these essential products through claims brought under state law around the country. Due to the extensive Federal Government involvement in the development and growth of the domestic oil and gas industry, Appellants' claims implicate uniquely federal interests that are necessarily governed by federal law.

Oil and gas products are critical to national security, economic stability and military preparedness. For more than 100 years, the Federal Government has actively encouraged – indeed it has compelled – domestic exploration, production and sale of oil and gas. As federal courts have recognized, petroleum products have been “*crucial* to the national defense,” including but by no means limited to “fuel and diesel oil used in the Navy’s ships; and lubricating oils used for various military machines.” *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. United States*, 2020 WL 5573048, at \*31 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2020) (emphasis added); *see also id.* at \*47 (noting the “value of [the] petroleum industry’s contribution to the nation’s military success”). The Federal Government has incentivized and contracted with Appellees to obtain oil and gas products to ensure a dependable, abundant supply of oil and gas for the nation’s economic and military security.

Nevertheless, despite energy producers’ critical role in the nation’s economic and military security, Appellants seek to use state courts to regulate the production of oil and gas products and by extension the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the use of those products. As the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit recognized in *City of New York*, “[i]t [wa]s precisely *because* fossil fuels emit greenhouse gases – which collectively ‘exacerbate global warming’ – that the ‘plaintiff[] [wa]s seeking damages.’” 993 F.3d at 91, 97. “Consequently, though the City’s lawsuit would regulate cross-border emissions in an indirect and roundabout manner, it would regulate them nonetheless.” *Id.* at 93. Therefore, the court concluded that the city’s “sprawling” claims were “simply beyond the limits of state law.” *Id.* at 92; *see also Bucks Cnty. v BP P.L.C.*, No. 2024-01836, 2025 WL 1484203, at \*7 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. May 16, 2025) (finding “Bucks County [was] truly seeking redress for harm caused by climate change, a global phenomenon caused by the emission of greenhouse gases in every nation in the world” and such claims “are the solely within the province of federal law”). So, here too, these municipalities seek “damages for the cumulative impact of conduct occurring simultaneously across just about every jurisdiction on the planet.” *City of New York*, 993 F.3d at 92. Therefore, the heart of their claims is not local in nature but instead worldwide, and as such, is “beyond the limits of state law.” *Id.*<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Indeed, in the related Delaware climate change case, Appellants’ counsel, who represents many states and municipalities in these cases, argued for certification of an interlocutory appeal to the Delaware Supreme Court of the state trial court’s Order dismissing all of Delaware’s claims predicated on out-of-state emissions as preempted by federal law. Appellants’ counsel admitted that limiting the case to in-state emissions would significantly shrink the scope of the case: “The Order’s CAA preemption ruling, which precludes tort

We share the Second Circuit’s concerns. The specter of huge and inconsistent damage awards across the country is likely to trigger cascading effects, gravely imperiling our military preparedness. *Id.* at 93-94 (citing *Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Conn.*, 564 U.S. 410, 427 (2011) (explaining that “[t]o permit this suit to proceed under state law would further risk upsetting the careful balance that has been struck between the prevention of global warming, a project that necessarily requires national standards and global participation, on the one hand, and energy production, economic growth, foreign policy, and *national security*, on the other” (emphasis added))). Because “states will invariably differ in their assessment of the proper balance between these national and international objectives, there is a real risk that subjecting the [energy companies’] global operations to a welter of different states’ laws could undermine important federal policy choices.” *Id.* “To hold the [energy company defendants] accountable ... would ... bypass the various diplomatic channels that the United States uses to address this issue.” *Id.* at 103.

The lower courts here all reached the same conclusion: Appellants’ claims are preempted by the federal structure of our Constitution and federal law. *See Baltimore v. BP*, No. 24-C-18-004219, Mem. Op. and Order at 14, 19; *City of Annapolis v. BP*, No. C-

---

liability insofar as it involves out-of-state emissions, fundamentally constrains the State’s theory and proof of its case. Whereas the State originally set out to prove that Defendants’ [alleged violations of state law] injured the State by increasing emissions in Delaware *and elsewhere* (italics in the original), it must now prevail on a far narrower path to liability, causation and damages, namely that Defendants’ tortious conduct caused in-state impacts by increasing *exclusively in-state emissions* (italics in the original). The Order potentially drastically limits the State’s ultimate damages claim....” State of Delaware’s Application for Certification of Interlocutory Appeal, at 15, *Delaware v. BP Am. Inc.*, No. N20C-09-097 (Del. Super. Ct., filed Jan. 19, 2024).

02-CV-21-000250, at 13. We agree. As the Second Circuit explained “regulation can be effectively exerted through an award of damages.” 993 F.3d at 93. Although “the City’s lawsuit would regulate cross-border emissions in an indirect and roundabout manner, it would regulate them nonetheless.” *Id.* at 92-93.

It is precisely this “indirect and roundabout” *de facto* regulation of available fuel sources that concerns us. State tort damages and abatement cases unduly risk constricting the availability of oil and gas to the detriment of national security interests, at a critical juncture in our Nation’s history, when geopolitical forces and energy security are especially vulnerable to belligerent nations. The availability of Appellees’ fuel products remains crucial to the success of our armed forces. As Admiral Mullen once put it, “[e]nergy security needs to be one of the first things we think about, before we deploy another soldier, before we build another ship or plane, and before we buy or fill another rucksack.”<sup>4</sup>

And while Appellants may argue that their cases are only about commercial speech and warnings to consumers – and are not about stopping the sale of fossil fuels – the reality is their theory of causation and the relief they seek is not so limited. “[R]egulation can be effectively exerted through an award of damages,” *Kurns v. Railroad Friction Prods. Corp.*, 565 U.S. 625, 637 (2012) (cleaned up), and “[s]tate power” can be wielded as much by the “application of a state rule of law in a civil lawsuit as by a statute,” *BMW of N. Am., Inc. v. Gore*, 517 U.S. 559, 572 n.17 (1996). Environmental tort claims force defendants “to change [their] methods of doing business.” *Int’l Paper Co. v. Ouellette*, 479 U.S. 481,

---

<sup>4</sup> Energy Security Forum, Washington, D.C., Oct. 13, 2010, <https://www.dvidshub.net/news/58040/mullen-military-has-strategic-imperative-save-resources>.

495 (1987). Allowing Appellants to obtain their requested sweeping relief, therefore, “would encourage courts to use vague public nuisance standards to scuttle the nation’s carefully created system for accommodating the need for energy production and the need for clean air. The result would be a balkanization of clean air regulations and a confused patchwork of standards, to the detriment of industry and the environment alike.” *North Carolina, ex rel. Cooper v. Tenn. Valley Auth.*, 615 F.3d 291, 301 (4th Cir. 2010); *see also United States v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal.*, 332 U.S. 301, 311 (1947).

Because Appellants’ Complaints seek to penalize Appellees for their lawful past, present and future sale of oil and gas, they risk making Appellees’ oil and gas products prohibitively costly and scarce. Their claims, therefore, necessarily cause national security concerns. This *amicus* brief provides an historical background of the Federal Government’s oversight and control of the oil and gas industry, and an explanation of how these state court damages and abatement suits imperil our nation’s ability to be “deployment-ready.”

## **ARGUMENT**

For more than a century, and to this day, the Federal Government has incentivized, compelled and controlled aspects of United States oil and gas sales and has reserved rights to take additional control for the benefit of the nation’s defense, security, and economy. The Federal Government has required and otherwise been inextricably involved in the development of the nation’s oil resources both for governmental use and the use of billions of consumers. Appellants’ claims arising from the production and sale of oil and gas necessarily implicate the Federal Government’s actions and policy choices, including the



extensive history of federal laws, contracts and leases that supported and controlled significant portions of our nation’s fuel supply.

**I. The Important National Security Interests in the Crosshairs of These Cases: A Historical Overview of the Federal Government’s Role in the Production and Sale of Oil and Gas.**

More than a century ago, in 1910, President Taft implored Congress to develop domestic oil sources: “As not only the largest owner of oil lands, but as a prospective large consumer of oil by reason of the increasing use of fuel oil by the Navy, the Federal Government is directly concerned both in encouraging rational development and at the same time insuring the longest possible life to the oil supply.” Hearings Before Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Estimates Submitted by the Secretary of the Navy, 64th Cong. 761 (1915).

Within two years, on September 2, 1912, President Taft established by Executive Order the first “Naval Petroleum Reserve” at Elk Hills, California, taking the extraordinary step of withdrawing large portions of land from eligibility for private ownership and designating them for the development of fuel resources to ensure the United States Navy would remain deployment-ready in the event of war. *See* U.S. Gov’t Accountability Off., GAO/RCED-87-75FS, Naval Petroleum Reserves: Oil Sales Procedures and Prices at Elk Hills, April Through December 1986, at 3 (1987) (“GAO Fact Sheet”).<sup>5</sup>

The defining characteristic of World War I was mechanization (*i.e.*, the emergence of tanks, aircraft, and submarines), and accordingly “oil and its products began to rank as

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.gao.gov/assets/90/87497.pdf>.

among the principal agents by which the Allies would conduct war and by which they could win it.’” Ian O. Lessor, *Resources and Strategy: Vital Materials in International Conflict 1600 – The Present* (1989) at 42. The necessity was echoed among the Allies, as British Cabinet Minister Walter Long expressed in an address to the House of Commons in 1917:

Oil is probably more important at this moment than anything else. You may have men, munitions, and money, but if you do not have oil, ... all your other advantages would be of comparatively little value.

Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money & Power* 177 (1991).

By 1917, American oil was vital for war efforts. As the Admiralty Director of Stores stated, “[W]ithout the aid of oil from America our modern oil-burning fleet cannot keep the sea.” Lessor, *Resources and Strategy* at 43. In response to the Allies’ cry for help, the United States provided over 80 percent of the Allied requirements for petroleum products and greatly influenced the outcome of the war. *Id.* (explaining that “petrol ... is as necessary as blood in the battles of tomorrow”) (quoting Clemenceau’s letter to President Wilson)).

World War II confirmed petroleum’s role as a key American resource and underscored the government’s interest in maintaining and managing it. Statement of Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator of War, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, S. Res. 36, at 4 (Nov. 28, 1945) (“Our overseas forces required nearly twice as many tons of oil as arms and armament, ammunition, transportation and construction equipment, food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, and all other materials together. In both essentiality and quantity, oil has become the greatest of all munitions.”);

National Petroleum Council, *A National Oil Policy for the United States* at 1 (1949) (“A prime weapon of victory in two world wars, [oil] is a bulwark of our national security.”).

In 1941, as the United States prepared to enter World War II, its need for large quantities of oil and gas to produce high-octane fuel for planes (“avgas”), oil for ships, lubricants, and synthetic rubber far outstripped the nation’s capacity. Given the role played by strategic bombers, small attack bombers, fighters, and search and rescue aircraft, avgas was particularly essential to the war effort in both Europe and the Pacific. It is fair to describe it as the most critically needed petroleum product during the War. And it has continued being essential up to today. To ensure its supply, the Federal Government created agencies to control petroleum production and distribution; it directed the production of certain petroleum products; and it managed resources.

In 1942, President Roosevelt established several agencies to oversee wartime petroleum production, including the War Production Board (“WPB”) and the Petroleum Administration for War (“PAW”). The PAW centralized the government’s petroleum-related activities. The PAW dictated products, quantity and quality to America’s oil refiners. *See* John W. Frey & H. Chandler Ide, *A History of the Petroleum Administration for War, 1941-1945*, at 219 (1946).

At the direction of the Federal Government, the oil companies increased avgas production “over twelve-fold from approximately 40,000 barrels per day in December 1941 to 514,000 barrels per day in 1945, [which] was crucial to Allied success in the war.” *Shell Oil Co. v. United States*, 751 F.3d 1282, 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014). “No one who knows even the slightest bit about what the petroleum industry contributed ... can fail to

understand that it was, without the slightest doubt, one of the most effective arms of this Government” in fulfilling the government’s core defense functions. Statement of Senator O’Mahoney, Chairman, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, S. Res. 36, at 1 (Nov. 28, 1945) (emphasis added).

In 1950, President Truman, established the Petroleum Administration for Defense (“PAD”) under authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Pub. L. No. 81–774 (“DPA”). The PAD ordered production of oil and gas to ensure adequate quantities of avgas for military use. *Exxon*, 2020 WL 5573048, at \*28; *see also id.* at \*15 (detailing the government’s use of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to “force” the petroleum industry to “increase [its] production of wartime . . . petroleum products”).

To further promote domestic oil and gas production in 1953, Congress passed the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (“OCSLA”), directing the U.S. Department of the Interior to make nearly 27 million acres of the OCS available for “expeditious and orderly development” of fossil fuel production. 43 U.S.C. §1332(3).

During the Cold War, the U.S. military commanded the development of more innovative military fuels and continued its role as the driving force behind domestic production. During the 1960s, U.S. energy consumption increased 51%, compared to only 36% during the previous decade. Jay Hakes, *A Declaration of Energy Independence* 17 (2008). As demand continued to climb into the early 1970s, the Nation faced a precarious shortage of oil and gas.

To avert a national energy crisis, in 1973, President Nixon ordered a dramatic increase in development for ready-production from the OCS:

Approximately half of the oil and gas resources in this country are located on public lands, primarily on the Outer Continental Shelf [OCS]. The speed at which we can increase our domestic energy production will depend in large measure on how rapidly these resources can be developed. I am therefore directing the Secretary of the Interior to take steps which would triple the annual acreage leased on the Outer Continental Shelf by 1979 ....

Nixon Message, *N.Y. Times*, Apr. 19, 1973.<sup>6</sup>

The following year, President Nixon announced a goal of *energy independence* by 1980. Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, Pub. Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, at 59 (Jan. 30, 1974).<sup>7</sup> “Project Independence 1980” ordered, among other things, that the Secretary of the Interior “increase the acreage leased on the [OCS] to 10 million acres beginning in 1975, more than tripling what had originally been planned.” Special Message to the Congress on the Energy Crisis, Pub. Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, at 29 (Jan. 23, 1974).<sup>8</sup>

Congress passed the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973, determining that it was in the “national interest” to deliver oil and gas from Alaska’s North Slope “to domestic markets ... because of growing domestic shortages and increasing dependence upon insecure foreign sources.” Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act, Pub. L. No. 93-153, § 202(a), 87 Stat. 576, 584 (1973), Pub. L. No. 93-153, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-87/pdf/STATUTE-87-Pg576.pdf>.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/1973/04/19/archives/excerpts-from-nixon-message-developing-our-domestic-energy.html>.

<sup>7</sup> <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=miua.4731948.1974.001&seq=99>.

<sup>8</sup> <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=miua.4731948.1974.001&seq=69>.

To address “immediate and critical” petroleum shortages in the military brought by the 1973 OPEC Oil Embargo, the Federal Government invoked the DPA to bolster its reserves with additional petroleum from domestic oil and gas companies. Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, S. Rep. No. 94-1, Pt. 1, at 442 (Jan. 17, 1975, 1st Sess.).

In 1974, responding to President Nixon’s direction to “increase the acreage leased on the Outer Continental Shelf”, Congress amended OCSLA. This amendment increased federal control over lessees “to result in expedited exploration and development of the Outer Continental Shelf in order to achieve national economic and energy policy goals, assure national security, reduce dependence on foreign sources, and maintain a favorable balance of payments in world trade.” *California ex rel. Brown v. Watt*, 668 F.2d 1290, 1296 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (quoting 43 U.S.C. § 1802); *see also* Special Message to the Congress on the Energy Crisis, *supra*, at 29.<sup>9</sup>

In 1978, as part of amendments to OCSLA, the Congressional Ad Hoc Select Committee on the OCS concluded again that “alternative sources of energy will not be commercially practical for years to come,” H.R. Rep. No. 94-1084, at 254 (1976) and “[d]evelopment of our OCS resources will afford us needed time—as much as a generation—within which to develop alternative sources of energy.” H.R. Rep. No. 95-590, at 53 (1977).

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=miua.4731948.1974.001&seq=69>.

## **II. The Federal Government's Efforts to Ensure a Dependable, Abundant Supply of Oil and Gas Remain Essential to Its Conduct of Foreign Affairs and Military Preparedness.**

In 1995, Congress and President Bill Clinton amended OCSLA to permit the Secretary of the Interior to “unlock an estimated 15 billion barrels of oil in the central and western Gulf of Mexico” for exploration, production and sale. Press Secretary, White House Office of Communications, Statement on North Slope Oil Bill Signing (Nov. 28, 1995), 1995 WL 699656, at \*1.

Federal promotion and use of domestic oil continued to grow in the 2000s. In 2006, the Bush administration opened leases of approximately 8 million additional acres of OCS lands in the Gulf of Mexico to “address *high energy prices, protect American jobs, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil.*” Statement by President George W. Bush Upon Signing [H.R. 6111], Pub. Papers of the Presidents: George W. Bush, at 2217 (Dec. 20, 2006) (emphasis added).<sup>10</sup>

In 2010, President Obama “announc[ed] the expansion of offshore oil and gas exploration,” explaining that “in order to sustain economic growth, produce jobs, and keep our businesses competitive, *we are going to need to harness traditional sources of fuel* even as we ramp up production of new sources of renewable, homegrown energy.”

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://books.google.com/books?id=o2ei8yOphboC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

President Barack Obama, Remarks on Energy at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland (Mar. 31, 2010) (emphasis added).<sup>11</sup>

In 2019, the United States became a net total energy exporter for the first time since 1952. U.S. Energy Info. Admin., U.S. Energy Facts Explained (Apr. 27, 2020), <https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/us-energy-facts/imports-and-exports.php>. The Department of Defense alone purchased 94.2 million barrels of military-spec compliant fuel products, totaling \$12.1 billion in procurement actions.<sup>12</sup> And even recently, as former Vice Admiral Robert Harward reports, “energy manufacturers [were] answering President Biden’s directive to export natural gas to our allies in Europe. For example, the U.S. [was] able to respond to Russia’s chokehold of the European energy market by increasing shipments of liquefied natural gas and crude oil by 137 percent and 38 percent, respectively.”<sup>13</sup>

When Appellants’ Complaints are viewed within the historical context of the Federal Government’s pervasive control and direction of oil and gas production, it is clear Appellants’ state law claims seek to undercut these national and international policies and actions governing the sale of oil and gas and trigger national security concerns for a reliable and stable energy supply.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-energy-security-andrews-air-force-base-3312010>.

<sup>12</sup> Def. Logistics Agency Energy, Fiscal Year 2019 Fact Book (2019) at 4, 27, [https://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/Energy/Publications/FactBookFiscalYear2019\\_highres.pdf?ver=2020-01-21-103755-473](https://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/Energy/Publications/FactBookFiscalYear2019_highres.pdf?ver=2020-01-21-103755-473).

<sup>13</sup> Robert Harward, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy Retired, U.S. Climate Lawsuits Endanger Military and U.S. National Security Interests, *American Military News* (April 20, 2023), <https://americanmilitarynews.com/2023/04/u-s-climate-lawsuits-endanger-military-and-u-s-national-security-interests/>.



### **III. Our Nation’s Vital Interests in Fuel Security and Managing Climate Change Cannot be Regulated by a Patchwork of State-Court Actions.**

At the end of the day, we are concerned that the upshot of this litigation and the broad relief it seeks would negatively impact strong national interests in fuel security and military readiness. Fuel security is a crucial national interest and is especially critical to the U.S. military, in times of both war and peace, to power ships, tanks, and aircraft, provide energy to run bases, stations, and detachments, and enable numerous operations. It should thus come as no surprise that the US military is the single largest purchaser and consumer of fuel in the United States.

Climate change is likewise an issue of critical national (indeed, global) importance. Greenhouse-gas emissions are transboundary in nature and thus present a matter of uniquely national concern. *See City of New York*, 993 F.3d at 85-86 (“Global warming presents a uniquely international problem of national concern.”). Because national security issues and climate change concerns are both uniquely federal interests, they must be addressed and solved by the federal government and the political branches, not through bread-and-butter state law tort claims. *See Torres v. Texas Dep’t of Pub. Safety*, 597 U.S. 580, 590 (2022) (“[T]he Constitution’s text, across several Articles, strongly suggests a complete delegation of authority to the Federal Government to provide for the common defense . . . [Therefore] [t]hese substantial limitations on state authority, together with the assignment of sweeping power to the Federal Government, provide strong evidence that the structure of the Constitution prevents States from frustrating national objectives in this field.”); *American Ins. Ass’n v. Garamendi*, 539 U.S. 396, 413 (2003) (quoting *Banco*

*National de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 376 U.S. 398, 427 n.25 (1964) (“There is . . . no question that at some point an exercise of state power that touches on foreign relations must yield to the National Government’s policy, given the ‘concern for uniformity in this country’s dealings with foreign nations’ that animated the Constitution’s allocation of the foreign relations power to the National Government in the first place.”).

Litigating Appellants’ claims against Appellees in a decentralized way under various states’ laws will undermine these vital national interests and undermine a reliable domestic fuel supply. It would subject Appellees to potential liability and injunctions under a patchwork of state laws, without a uniform guide. Courts have recognized that this would “risk upsetting the careful balance that has been struck between the prevention of global warming, a project that necessarily requires national standards and global participation, on the one hand, and energy production, economic growth, foreign policy, and national security, on the other.” *City of New York*, 993 F.3d at 93; *see also id.* (“And as states will invariably differ in their assessment of the proper balance between these national and international objectives, there is a real risk that subjecting the Producers’ global operations to a welter of different states’ laws could undermine important federal policy choices.”); *Baltimore*, No. 24-C-18-004219, Mem. Op. and Order at 14 (“Congress and the expert agency are better equipped to do the job than individual district or state judges issuing ad hoc, case-by-case injunctions or decisions”) (cleaned up); *Annapolis*, No. C-02-CV-21-000250, at 13 (noting that judges are less well suited than expert agencies to assess “complex scientific, economic and technological issues and balance competing and complex interests”).

To be sure, the United States Military continues to look for “greener” ways to fuel the military, and we support ameliorating climate change risks at our bases, but the reality is the U.S. military must always take into account its enemies’ own fossil-fuel uses and potential superior deployment abilities because of those uses. The United States could go it alone and unilaterally strip itself of higher-performing fossil fuels, but that risks putting the Nation at a significant competitive disadvantage, militarily and otherwise. The ruinous damages these cases seek risk knee-capping this country while empowering others who seek to exploit just such vulnerabilities. Stated differently, energy security and national security go hand-in-hand; we cannot achieve national security without first accomplishing energy security.

At bottom, our experience has taught us that private-sector production and sale of oil and gas are essential to our military operations and thus our national security. Our Constitutional oath includes our commitment to “support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic,” which necessarily includes a commitment to ensure the military has sufficient fuel to accomplish its missions. To adhere to that oath, it is the duty of military officers to enable a plentiful supply of fuel to operate vehicles, ships, and planes. Because energy is essential to protect our Nation, its people, and the world at large, the decision of how much is appropriate must be left with the Federal Government and the branches of the Federal Government tasked with our foreign policy and national security. Therefore, we urge this Court to affirm the lower courts’ dismissal of the state law claims as preempted by federal law.

## **CONCLUSION**

The decisions of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Cary Silverman*

---

Cary Silverman (AIS #0012130282)  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
1800 K Street NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 783-8400  
csilverman@shb.com

Tristan L. Duncan  
(*pro hac vice* motion pending)  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550  
tlduncan@shb.com

Dated: July 15, 2025

**CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT  
AND COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 8-112**

1. This brief contains 5,504 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted from the word count by Rule 8-503.

2. This brief complies with the font, spacing, and type size requirements stated in Rule 8-112.

*/s/ Cary Silverman*

Cary Silverman (AIS #0012130282)

**RULE 8-504(A)(8) STATEMENT OF FONTS**

This brief was printed utilizing proportionally spaced font. The body and footnotes are printed in Times New Roman, 13 Point.

*/s/ Cary Silverman*

Cary Silverman (AIS #0012130282)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the 15th day of July 2025, the foregoing Brief of *Amici Curiae* was filed and served electronically via MDEC upon all counsel of record.

/s/ Cary Silverman

Cary Silverman (AIS #0012130282)