



13501 Ranch Road 12 #103  
Wimberley, TX 78676

September 18, 2025

The Honorable Jim Jordan  
Chairman  
House Committee on the Judiciary  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Jordan:

I write to bring your attention to newly surfaced evidence directly relevant to the Judiciary Committee's ongoing investigation into the Environmental Law Institute's (ELI) Climate Judiciary Project (CJP).

A court filing submitted by Chevron Corporation on September 12 in the *Multnomah County v. ExxonMobil et al.* climate lawsuit reveals that one of the plaintiffs' lead attorneys, Roger Worthington, had undisclosed involvement in at least two so-called scientific studies that the county is presenting as independent, peer-reviewed evidence.

Notably, one of these studies (Christopher Callahan & Justin Mankin, *Carbon Majors and The Scientific Case for Climate Liability*, in *Nature*, 2025) explicitly acknowledged funding from the Climate Judiciary Project in a draft version, but that disclosure was inexplicably removed from the final publication.

Early drafts of the study, marked "DO NOT DISTRIBUTE," were hosted on Mr. Worthington's law firm website. The study, a work of "attribution science" designed for use in climate cases, purports to attribute global economic losses from climate change to specific oil companies.

In addition, Mr. Worthington's website includes a pre-publication draft of a CJP judicial training module—complete with internal editorial comments—raising serious questions about how and why a plaintiffs' attorney had early access to, and possibly editorial influence over, materials being presented to state and federal judges as "neutral" science. The module, "*Drawing the Causal Chain: The Detection and Attribution of Climate Change*," "educates" participant judges on how to apply "attribution science" in the courtroom.

These facts appear to directly contradict ELI's previous statement to the Committee that "CJP does not participate in litigation, provide support for or coordinate with any parties in litigation,



or advise judges on how they should rule.” If accurate, the Chevron filing reveals exactly the kind of covert coordination and judicial manipulation that CJP has publicly denied and that your Committee is rightfully scrutinizing.

As the CEO of the American Energy Institute, I urge the Committee to formally request or subpoena records from both ELI and the plaintiffs’ counsel in the Multnomah County case. This includes communications, draft documents, funding agreements, and internal editorial notes related to the scientific studies and CJP curriculum.

Judges and the public deserve to know whether the courtroom is being quietly shaped by coordinated climate advocacy posing as neutral expertise. ELI and Roger Worthington should provide straight answers to the following questions:

- Did ELI fund the Mankin and Callahan study? If so, why was this disclosure removed from the final version?
- Did Worthington have any material input into the Mankin and Callahan study, or any of its predecessor drafts? Did Worthington fund the study or the researchers?
- Did Worthington have any material input into ELI’s judicial education module on attribution science?
- Does ELI regularly seek input from plaintiffs’ attorneys on its judicial education modules?

We commend your leadership in bringing transparency and accountability to these critical matters and stand ready to assist your investigation in any way that may be helpful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hon. Jason Isaac', written over a horizontal line.

Hon. Jason Isaac  
Chief Executive Officer  
American Energy Institute