

MARCH 2025

VOL. 25-3

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: A NEW DAY

Victoria Prussen Spears

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S DAY-ONE EXECUTIVE ORDERS: ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

John Clay Taylor, James F. Bowe, Jr., Craig A. Phillips, Nikesh Jindal, Dan Feldman and Suyoung Moon

REGULATORY CLOUDS ON THE HORIZON FOR SOLAR FINANCING? PROGRAMS FACE HEADWINDS, BUT THE FUTURE STILL LOOKS BRIGHT

Eric T. Mitzenmacher and Joy Tsai

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INDICTMENT SIGNALS INCREASING SCRUTINY OF CARBON CREDITS

William J. Curtis, Kristopher "Neil" Austin and Virginia Y. Duong

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD APPROVES LOW CARBON FUEL STANDARD AMENDMENTS

Maureen F. Gorsen, Peter Whitfield, Caleb J. Bowers, Brooklyn Hildebrandt and Abigail Kuchnir

AGREEMENT ON NEW EU GAS PROJECTS AND MEASURES UNDER THE EUROPEAN GREEN DEAL

Michael Jürgen Werner, Julia Kampouridi and Flupke van den Bogart

WHAT IS HALEU?

Scott Stiegler and Lauren-Emma Parrott

WHAT ARE STATES' LEGAL OBLIGATIONS IN RELATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE?

Louise Woods, Sophie J. Freelove and Simon Michau

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 25

NUMBER 3

March 2025

Editor's Note: A New Day

Victoria Prussen Spears

59

President Trump's Day-One Executive Orders: Energy and Environment

John Clay Taylor, James F. Bowe, Jr., Craig A. Phillips, Nikesh Jindal, Dan Feldman and Suyoung Moon

61

Regulatory Clouds on the Horizon for Solar Financing? Programs Face Headwinds, But the Future Still Looks Bright

Eric T. Mitzenmacher and Joy Tsai

70

U.S. Department of Justice Indictment Signals Increasing Scrutiny of Carbon Credits

William J. Curtis, Kristopher "Neil" Austin and Virginia Y. Duong

75

California Air Resources Board Approves Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments

Maureen F. Gorsen, Peter Whitfield, Caleb J. Bowers, Brooklyn Hildebrandt and Abigail Kuchnir

79

Agreement on New EU Gas Projects and Measures Under the European Green Deal

Michael Jürgen Werner, Julia Kampouridi and Flupke van den Bogart

82

What Is HALEU?

Scott Stiegler and Lauren-Emma Parrott

86

What Are States' Legal Obligations in Relation to Climate Change?

Louise Woods, Sophie J. Freelove and Simon Michau

89

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call or email:

Raeesa Hoosen, LLB. at (1908) 673-3323

Email: raeesa.hoosen@lexisnexis.co.za

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

LexisNexis® Support Center <https://supportcenter.lexisnexis.com/app/home/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)

ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)

ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT’S ENERGY LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2025 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2025 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Energy Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

U.S. Department of Justice Indictment Signals Increasing Scrutiny of Carbon Credits

*By William J. Curtis, Kristopher “Neil” Austin and Virginia Y. Duong**

In this article, the authors discuss an indictment of former corporate executives for allegedly selling fraudulent carbon offset credits to private parties.

On October 2, 2024, the U.S. Department of Justice indicted Kenneth Newcombe and Tridip Goswami, two former executives at CQC Impact Investors LLC (CQC), for allegedly selling fraudulent carbon offset credits to private parties. CQC was a major supplier and, allegedly, responsible for generating approximately 50% of the Voluntary Carbon Units (VCUs) purchased in the market. The indictment¹ alleges that the defendants provided false data to a third-party issuer of VCUs who issued VCUs to CQC. CQC then sold the VCUs to private third parties who used the VCUs to voluntarily offset their carbon emissions.

Two days before the Newcombe indictment, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) announced civil settlements with CQC and Jason Steele, CQC’s former chief operating officer. The CFTC also filed a complaint against Newcombe in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, alleging violations of the Commodity Exchange Act and Regulations.

IMPLICATIONS

The indictment and civil proceedings have broad implications for the carbon credits market utilized by private parties to offset their carbon footprint. Furthermore, the recent focus on the carbon credits market by the U.S. Department of Justice, SEC and CFTC may potentially lead to inquiries by other government agencies, including the IRS with respect to the carbon sequestration tax credits under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code.

First, the indictment highlights just how hard it will be to police the carbon market. CQC was among the world’s largest issuers of voluntary carbon credits and accounted for nearly half of the global issuances of voluntary carbon

* The authors, attorneys with Polsinelli, may be contacted at wcurtis@polsinelli.com, naustin@polsinelli.com and vduong@polsinelli.com, respectively.

¹ https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-10/indictment_-_us_v_newcombe_et_al._24_cr_567_redacted.pdf.

credits. As noted in the press release,² the government declined to prosecute³ CQC because CQC conducted an internal investigation and timely self-disclosed.

The government noted that it would be very difficult for it to detect this scheme without CQC's self-disclosure. CQC obtained its credits by, among other things, developing and installing cookstoves in rural African and Southeast Asian households that, if installed and used correctly, were more efficient than the preexisting cooking methods used in those regions (the Cookstove Projects). To determine how many VCUs would be received from the Cookstove Projects, CQC collected data regarding how much fuel was saved by the cookstoves and the number of stoves that were installed and operational. CQC then sent that data to an issuer of VCUs, which used a formula to calculate the amount of emission reductions and to determine how many VCUs would be issued.

There are a myriad of ways to reduce carbon emissions or sequester carbon. Some, like CQC's operations, span multiple countries. Others may be in one location. Different participants have different technologies and different sampling protocols. The sheer magnitude and diversity will make enforcement difficult.

Second, although CQC sold voluntary credits, those who are buying them may need to take good faith steps to ensure that the voluntary credits are valid. A recent report by Morgan Stanley⁴ found that the voluntary carbon market is expected to grow from \$2 billion in 2020 to around \$250 billion by 2050. Many environmental groups have claimed that the voluntary market is nothing more than "green washing," with the groups Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and World Wildlife Fund-UK making a joint statement on the issue as far back as 2006.⁵

Regulators have also upped the call and are beginning to implement additional requirements for those involved in the carbon market. For example, on May 8, 2024, the SEC finalized rules⁶ requiring companies to disclose certain climate-related information, such as the amount of carbon reduction represented by offsets that are purchased, as well as the source, basis for authentication, and cost of those offsets. Similarly, on October 7, 2023,

² <https://www.justice.gov/usao-sdny/pr/us-attorney-announces-criminal-charges-multi-year-fraud-scheme-market-carbon-credits>.

³ https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-10/cqc_-_declination_1.pdf.

⁴ <https://www.morganstanley.com/ideas/carbon-offset-market-growth>.

⁵ <https://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/august06.pdf>.

⁶ <https://www.sec.gov/files/rules/final/2024/33-11275.pdf>.

California signed into law Assembly Bill 1305, also known as the Voluntary Carbon Market Disclosures California Act.⁷ The California Act requires businesses that:

- (1) Market or sell voluntary carbon offsets in California;
- (2) Purchase or use voluntary carbon offsets sold in California that make emissions-related claims; or
- (3) Make claims that an entity or product has eliminated or made significant reductions to its emissions to disclose information such as the timeline and protocol for the carbon offset project.

Businesses affected by the California Act are required to post their first annual disclosure by January 1, 2025,⁸ and may be subject to a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day, not to exceed a total amount of \$500,000, if they fail to do so.

Finally, the Newcombe indictment and civil litigation may be a signal that the federal government is increasing its oversight and enforcement mechanisms in carbon offset markets and potentially other alternative energy sectors. For example, the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) provided a significant increase in the value of the income tax credit available for certain carbon offset facilities and expanded the number of projects that potentially qualify for the tax credit. Prior to the IRA, a geologically sequestered direct air capture (DAC) facility could qualify for a \$26-ton credit if the facility captured at least 100,000 metric tons. After the enactment of the IRA, a DAC facility paying prevailing wages (and subject to other qualifications) can qualify for a \$130 ton credit if it captures at least 1,000 metric tons. The IRA also permits the transferability of certain tax credits to third-party purchasers that may have little to no affiliation with the carbon offset industry.

CONCLUSION

As the Newcombe indictment highlights, it will be difficult for the government to identify fraud. The IRS, EPA and other states and agencies will need to share data and expertise. Given the size of the market and the potential difficulties in enforcement, the government is likely to encourage good governance and self-disclosure by aggressively prosecuting those who do not disclose while showing lenience towards those who do.

The government's declination to prosecute CQC underscores the importance of good corporate governance, timely and thorough internal investigations and

⁷ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB1305.

⁸ <https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000018c-3b62-d0ce-a98c-7f6a88a50000>.

self-disclosure by companies. However, self-disclosure can be complicated and is not always a get-out-of jail-free card.