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Quote of the Week: If you put feedback into a computer model, you can prove anything.
John Brignell, 2002  http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/computer_modelling.htm

Number of the Week: 15 times

THIS WEEK:
By Ken Haapala, Executive Vice President, Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

Discovering History? A paper by Zhengyu Liu et al. of the University of Wisconsin-Madison raises an important question. As cited in past TWTW’s, observations show that there has been a general cooling since the Holocene Climate Optimum, about 8,000 to 5,000 years ago. [The paper states about 10,000 to 6,000 years ago.] There have been other warm periods in the past 10,000 years. In his presentation at the July International Conference on Climate Change, Geologist Don Easterbrook asserted that until the Little Ice Age began about 1300 AD, the climate had been 2.5 to 5.5 °F warmer than today for about 8,500 years.

Using three climate models, Liu and his colleagues ran multiple simulations, which showed global warming over the past 10,000 years. In comments in the University press release Liu states” “Data from observation says global cooling. The physical model says it has to be warming.” He asks which is right the physical observations or the models?

Published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), the difference between model results and observations are presented as a conundrum, a difficult problem which has no clear answer, a riddle. Further, the PNAS contained the following editorial comments. Significance: Marine and terrestrial proxy records suggest global cooling during the Late Holocene, following the peak warming of the Holocene Thermal Maximum (∼10 to 6 ka) until the rapid warming induced by increasing anthropogenic greenhouses gases. However, the physical mechanism responsible for this global cooling has remained elusive. Here, we show that climate models simulate a robust global annual mean warming in the Holocene, mainly in response to rising CO2 and the retreat of ice sheets. This model-data inconsistency demands a critical reexamination of both proxy data and models. [Boldface added.]

In short, the PNAS release downplays the significance of the inconsistency between the models and observations and assumes that the recent warming was caused by greenhouse gases, chiefly carbon dioxide. This assumption is the critical issue – the influence of greenhouse gases (particularly carbon dioxide (CO2)) on the earth’s temperatures. Note that the increase in CO2 during the Holocene was not significant, until the latter part of the 20th century.

To SEPP, there is no conundrum. Models are not necessarily representations of the physical world. If the model has not been verified and validated, there is no reason to accept that the model is an accurate representation on the physical world. No climate model has been verified and validated. In general, the climate models erroneously forecast a strong warming trend for over a decade where there has been no warming trend. This failure clearly indicates that the climate models overstate the influence of CO2 on the earth’s temperatures. The climate establishment is
engaged in a mind-set that is incorrect. See links under Models v. Observations and http://climateconferences.heartland.org/don-easterbrook-iccc9-panel-19/

Discovering Past Discoveries: In 1939, Carl-Gustaf Arvid Rossby identified Rossby waves in the atmosphere. Variations in the waves have long been associated with hot spells and cold spells. The general pattern of wind flow is called the circumpolar vortex. As explained by H.H. Lamb in *Climate, History, and the Modern World*, copyrighted in 1982 and 1995, the circumpolar vortex is the “single great circumpolar flow of winds circuiting from west to east around the Earth over each hemisphere, mainly over the middle latitudes.” … it “is the main flow of the atmosphere, carrying most of the momentum. The flow is never strictly circular around the pole, but exhibits more or less prominent wave-like meanders, the so-called ridges and troughs in the pattern.” These meanders are called Rossby waves and are associated with the jet stream.

As Tim Ball has explained on his web site numerous times, if the Rossby waves are in a strong, U-shaped, north-south direction, (called longitudinal or Meridional), high and low pressure systems tend to remain fixed over a region of the earth for an extended period. Such stationary pressure systems intensify whatever is characteristic for the system for that region and time of year such as droughts, floods, hot spells, and cold spells, etc.

In a paper published in PNAS, members of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK) claim they have strong statistical evidence that since the year 2000 the north–south Rossby waves have been “almost twice as frequent as before”, resulting in far more extreme weather events in the Northern Hemisphere. They attribute this increase to the melting of the Arctic sea ice. PIK has blamed the summer melting Arctic sea ice on human-caused global warming from CO2 emissions.

As usual, the word “before” in the phrase “almost twice as frequent as before” remains undefined. Since variations in Rossby waves have been known for decades, one must question the very short period covered by the paper.

On her blog, Jo Nova presents a chart of the annual values of the U.S. Heat Wave Index from 1895 to 2013. Since 2000, the index is not higher than the mid-1950s, and early and late 1980s. The extremely high heat index for the 1930s debunks any claimed relationship between CO2 emissions and heat waves in the US. Of course, one cannot generalize for the remainder of the Northern Hemisphere, but there is more than sufficient reason to doubt the rigor of the paper. See links under Un-Science or Non-Science? Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague? and http://drtimball.com/2012/current-global-weather-patterns-normal-despite-government-and-media-distortions/

CO2 Influence: Writing in Watts Up With That, Ed Hoskins gives a solid presentation, with good graphs, on the logarithmic relationship between CO2 concentrations and its greenhouse effect. One must be aware that, in general, the experimental research was done with dry air, which does not include the dominant greenhouse gas, water vapor. High humidity of a particular region will reduce the influence of CO2 for that region. The vexing problems are feedbacks. The alarmists, and their models, predict net positive feedbacks. The main assertion is that a warming from CO2 will be amplified by an increase in water vapor. The skeptics assert that the net feedbacks are negative – increase in cloud cover. The feedback issue makes it difficult to determine the temperature effect of a doubling of CO2. With the current trend of no significant warming or
cooling as CO2 emissions are increasing, nature seems to be supporting the skeptics. See link under Challenging the Orthodoxy.

Disappearing in the Deep? On his web site, Roy Spencer gives a plausible explanation of how the deep ocean can warm, without an observable surface warming. This explanation is useful. But, it does not explain how a CO2 warming, which occurs in the atmosphere, can disappear into the deep oceans without being observed in the atmosphere. See link under Seeking a Common Ground.

EPA Health Issues: In March, eleven members of Congress who are health care professionals challenged the EPA for its claimed health benefits from its proposed rules on carbon dioxide emissions. Their letter has three major assertions. 1. Unilateral carbon rules will not create domestic health benefits; 2, extraordinary energy costs will diminish public health; and 3, threats to electric reliability will diminish public health. The members call for the EPA to level with the American public on public health and carbon regulations. The letter will be useful for SEPP preparing its comments on EPA incorrectly using public health as a justification for controlling energy sources and uses. See links under EPA and other Regulators on the March.

EPA Numbers: The General Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report questioning EPA's calculation of costs and benefits from seven major rules on air, water, and other environmental issues that were made final between 2009 and 2011. The process is known as Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) and the GAO suggests that the EPA did not follow Office of Management and Budget guidance for the RIA. In the view of critics, the process EPA uses is not transparent, but opaque. See links under EPA and other Regulators on the March.

EPA Ozone Rules: EPA is considering tightening its rules on ozone, which were adopted in 2008. It is now considering reducing the standards from 75 parts per billion to 60 parts per billion. The old rules are not yet fully implemented, and much of the technology needed to achieve the new standards has not been identified. The EPA asserted that the new rules will have a compliance cost of $90 billion in 2020. A study commissioned by the National Association of Manufacturers put it closer to $270 billion.

One can quibble about the numbers, but the direction of the regulations is clear – EPA gaining control over economic growth. Under these rules, most major increases in economic activity, other than in very rural areas will require approval by the EPA. See Article #4.

EIA Study? The Energy Information Agency (EIA) issued a report that showed little change in coal-generation of electricity through 2040. Natural gas-generation was forecast to grow the most in all sections of the country, renewable-generation to grow appreciably in the west, and nuclear-generation to be flat in all sections. The report explained that hydroelectric generation is dominant in the Pacific Northwest, (which generates power for California). According to the report, other forms of renewables will grow as well.

The report did not explain why the writers expect coal-generation will not fall in face of EPA proposed regulations that require closing of coal-fired plants and other regulations that prevent the construction of new coal-fired plants. However, the referenced source is the Annual Energy Outlook released in May 7, 2014 – before the release of new EPA CO2 regulations. See links under Energy Issues – US and http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/
**Oh’ Mann:** Mr. Mann’s litigation against Mr. Steyn et al. is hitting rocks – a friend in court brief in favor of Mr. Steyn was filed by the American Civil Liberties Union and major US media organizations such as Association of American Publishers, Bloomberg, USA Today, Washington Post, and the Los Angeles Times. Apparently, these organizations are becoming aware that Mr. Mann brought up major anti-freedom of speech issues in his litigation. Mr. Mann will probably find the going a bit tougher this time than the patronizing investigations by Penn State and government entities that he questionably claims exonerated him. See links under Oh’ Mann.

***************

**Wind Power:** Wind power is unreliable, but that is no reason for politicians and governments not to spend money trying to deploy it. One of the latest fads is harnessing high altitude winds. The US National Science Foundation and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency are financing the mapping of high altitude winds in the hopes of harnessing them. The concept of using lighter than air devices, such as balloons, to float wind turbines in the air has been thoroughly shown to be absurd by British engineer John Brignell. Since Defense Threat Reduction Agency is involved, could it be a top-secret antiaircraft program? See link under Below the Bottom Line and [http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/cables.htm](http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/cables.htm)

***************

**Number of the Week:** 15 times. According to an op-ed written by the president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, in 2012, when implementing the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) the EPA claimed that only 4 gigawatts of capacity of coal-fired plants would be lost. Now, two years later, “U.S. is already facing the loss of 60 gigawatts of power over the next three years, the result of older coal plants' being forced to shut down because they cannot comply with the EPA's” standards. The estimate of the loss of electrical generation capacity from this rule alone has grown 15 times in two years. Many of the plants slated to be closed were needed in the extreme cold spell last winter.

The GAO report discussed above does not include this gross underestimate of costs. And some EPA officials wonder why they cannot build trust with many on Capitol Hill? See Article # 3.

#ARTICLES:
For the numbered articles below, please see this week’s TWTW at: [www.sepp.org](http://www.sepp.org). The articles are at the end of the pdf.

1. **Carbon dioxide keeps the Earth green**
   Editor, Times-Dispatch: By Fred Singer, VA-SEEE, Aug 11, 2014
   [http://www.timesdispatch.com/opinion/your-opinion/letters-to-the-editor/letters-to-the-editor/article_b7ac6dbb-7795-5107-9315-777a1b07c0f0.html](http://www.timesdispatch.com/opinion/your-opinion/letters-to-the-editor/letters-to-the-editor/article_b7ac6dbb-7795-5107-9315-777a1b07c0f0.html)

2. **Climate Science Does Not Support IPCC Conclusions**
   By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Aug 15, 2014
   [http://americanthinker.com/2014/08/climate_science_does_not_support_ipcc_conclusions.html](http://americanthinker.com/2014/08/climate_science_does_not_support_ipcc_conclusions.html)

3. **Electrical Workers vs. the EPA**
   We union members oppose new anticarbon rules that will cost jobs and endanger the grid.
   By Edwin Hill, WSJ, Aug 14, 2014

4. **The EPA's Latest Threat to Economic Growth**
   The agency's needless new ozone standard could cost Americans $270 billion annually.
By Jay Timmons, WSJ, Aug 13, 2014
http://online.wsj.com/articles/the-epas-latest-threat-to-economic-growth-1407970689
Link to study: Potential Economic Impacts of a Stricter Ozone Standard,
By Staff Writers, NEPA Economic Consulting, July 2014
http://www.nam.org/-/media/29876087653A4D74BFE191551FC024EC.ashx

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Science: Is the Sun Rising?
New paper finds multiple solar amplification mechanisms which modulate winter surface temperatures
By Staff Writer, The Hockey Schtick, Aug 11, 2014
Link to paper: Spatial distribution of Northern Hemisphere winter temperatures during different phases of the solar cycle

Suppressing Scientific Inquiry
It’s an Unsettling Climate for skeptical scientists like Murry Salby
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Aug 14, 2014

Challenging the Orthodoxy – ICCE-9
Inside the Global Warming Skeptics Conference
By Norman Rogers, American Thinker, Aug 9, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://www.americanthinker.com/2014/08/inside_the_global_warming_skeptics_conference.html

Challenging the Orthodoxy
The diminishing influence of increasing Carbon Dioxide on temperature
By Ed Hoskins, WUWT, Aug 10, 2014 [H/t Tom Sheahen]
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/08/10/the-diminishing-influence-of-increasing-carbon-dioxide-on-temperature/

Have We Lost Our Way?
By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Aug 15, 2014
https://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/08/15/have-we-lost-our-way/

On Climate Change
By Charles Battig, VA-SEEE, Crozet Gazette, Aug 7, 2014
http://www.crozetgazette.com/2014/08/to-the-editor-on-climate-changes/

All Rain Is Acid Rain
Lack of Data Is The Fundamental Problem
By Tim Ball, WUWT, Aug 15, 2014
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/08/15/all-rain-is-acid-rain/
Climate Change And The Human Condition: Is It Time To Reconsider Climatic Determinism?
By Tim Ball, WUWT, Aug 9, 2014

Earth’s Response to Increasing CO2: An Example of Hormesis?
By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Aug 11, 2014
http://www.drroyspencer.com/2014/08/earths-response-to-increasing-co2-an-example-of-hormesis/

Defending the Orthodoxy
A World In Chaos, And Kerry's Talking Climate Change
Editorial , IBD, Aug, 14, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

Don't believe the hype: 5 reasons to be pessimistic about climate change
As things stand, we are in for a world of hurt
By Neil Ehatiya, The Week, No Date [H/t Charles Shafer]
Unfortunately, owing to two centuries of industrialization, there is already a lot of damage built into the climate system, and we are already seeing the ways in which climate stress is affecting human security.
[SEPP Comment: The Policy Associate at The Century Foundations would prefer to have lived in an era when life was nasty, brutish, and short?]

Questioning the Orthodoxy
Saving the Planet, One Denier at a Time
By Bruce Bialosky, Townhall, Aug 10, 2014 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

Climate Polling Results Lead to Weird Press Coverage
By Roy Spencer, His blog, Aug 13, 2014

Reading climate articles backwards
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Aug 12, 2014

““Climate-smart” policies for Africa are stupid, and immoral – OPED
By Paul Driessen, Eurasia Review, Aug 11, 2014

Reasons to be cheerful
By Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Aug 15, 2014
http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/reasons-to-be-cheerful-(1).aspx
RC: 20 million Russian black holes needed for methane emergency
By Luboš Motl, The Reference Frame, Aug 14, 2014
http://motls.blogspot.com/2014/08/rc-20-million-russian-black-holes.html#more

WAPO – ‘Has the era of the climate change refugee begun?’
By Barry Brill, WUWT, Aug 12, 2014

Social Benefits of Carbon
Plants have unexpected response to climate change
By Jennifer Balmer, Science, Aug 8, 2014 [H/t GWPF]
[SEPP Comment: The Science magazine cannot possibly admit that this shift to lower elevations may be from the benefits of increased CO2.]

Problems in the Orthodoxy
Few Other Countries Are Following The Obama Administration’s Lead On Climate
By Andrew Powalena, Daily Caller, Aug 11, 2014
http://dailycaller.com/2014/08/11/few-other-countries-are-following-the-obama-administrations-lead-on-climate/

Why the Global Climate Treaty is Doomed
By Walter Russell Mead & Staff, American Interest, Aug 13, 2014
http://www.the-american-interest.com/blog/2014/08/13/why-the-global-climate-treaty-is-doomed/
[SEPP Comment: According to the authors: The West’s industrialization is largely responsible for the emissions that have gotten us to where we are now, while the developing world’s intent to follow suit represents the bigger future threat. And where are we? We are no longer in the Little Ice Age. If the increase in temperatures was the result of industrialization, then we all should be thankful. What is called voluntary efforts to reduce emissions may actually be efforts to reduce emissions per MW of electricity produced through increasing efficiency by building many more coal-fired plants resulting in a net increase of emissions.]

Seeking a Common Ground
A World In Chaos, And Kerry’s Talking Climate Change
Editorial , IBD, Aug, 14, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
[SEPP Comment: Would not the attitude that we should take no policy action unless we have compelling evidence be a different form of precaution? After all, government is demanding authoritarian control of energy, thus economic well-being.]

How deep ocean warming can “bypass the surface”
By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Aug 12, 2014

Microbes, rain, and climate
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Aug 14, 2014
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/08/14/microbes-rain-and-climate/
Reconciling Seemingly Contradictory Climate Claims
By Staff Writer, Coyote Blog, Jul 28, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
[SEPP Comment: Good explanation of why we can get seemingly contrary claims about temperature trends.]

The debate about climate change takes a new form. One familiar yet disturbing.
By Editor, Fabius Maximus, Aug 8, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC
For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

Woody Plant Encroachment on the USA's Southwestern Desert
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2014/aug/12aug2014a1.html

A 3,000-Year Record of Solar Activity
http://nipccreport.org/articles/2014/aug/12aug2014a2.html

The Likely Fate of Sea Stars in an Acidifying and Warming Ocean

CMIP5 Climate Model Biases

Models v. Observations
A global temperature conundrum: Cooling or warming climate?
By Staff Writers, Madison WI (SPX), Aug 12, 2014
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/A_global_temperature_conundrum_Cooling_or_warming_climate_999.html

Climate conundrum: Conflicting indicators on what preceded human-driven warming
By Kelly April Tyrell, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, News, Aug 11, 2014 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.news.wisc.edu/23050
Link to paper: The Holocene temperature conundrum
By Zhengyu Liu, et al. PNAS, Aug 11, 2014
http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2014/08/07/1407229111
The study was supported by grants from the (U.S.) National Science Foundation, the Chinese National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology.

**A Clear Example of IPCC Ideology Trumping Fact**
http://www.cato.org/blog/clear-example-ipcc-ideology-trumping-fact

**Meteorologists Sharply Criticize DWD German Weather Service… “The Science Is Groping In The Dark”**
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Aug 9, 2014

**Measurement Issues**
**Snow has thinned on Arctic sea ice**
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Aug 13, 2014
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/08/13/snow-has-thinned-on-arctic-sea-ice/

**Changing Weather**
**Normalized US Hurricane Losses 1900-2013**
[SEPP Comment: Hurricanes have not become more frequent or intense, regardless of what John Holdren, the President’s science advisor, says.]

**Insured losses from natural disasters down in 2014**
By Stephen Durham, Captive Insurance Times, Jul 25, 2014 [H/t GWPF]
[SEPP Comment: Hurricane season can make generalizing from semi-annual data foolish.]

**Recent Hawaiian Tropical Cyclones – Sea Surface Temperature Anomalies of the Storm Tracks**
By Bob Tisdale, WUWT, Aug 13, 2014

**El Nino Fizzle or Sizzle**
By Staff Writers, Washington DC (SPX), Aug 15, 2014
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/El_Nino_Fizzle_or_Sizzle_999.html

**Changing Climate**
**Climate relicts may help researchers understand climate change**
By Staff Writers, Science Daily, Aug 12, 2014
http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/08/140812163719.htm
Link to paper: Climate relicts and their associated communities as natural ecology and evolution laboratories.
By Scott Woolbright, Trends in Ecology & Evolution, July 2014
We’re Ill-Prepared for Global Cooling
By Maurice Newman, The Australian, Via GWPF, Aug 14, 2014
http://www.thegwpf.org/maurice-newman-were-ill-prepared-for-global-cooling/

Changing Seas
Claim: Sea-level spikes can harm beaches worse than hurricane
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Aug 12, 2014
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/08/12/claim-sea-level-spikes-can-harm-beaches-worse-than-hurricane/
Link to paper: Sea-level spikes can harm beaches worse than hurricane
By Alexandra Branscombe, AGU Blog, Aug 5, 2014
[SEPP Comment: As if storm surges never existed before. The barrier islands are known to be constantly shifting.]

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice
2010 Chilean earthquake causes icequakes in Antarctica
By Staff Writers, Atlanta GA (SPX), Aug 12, 2014
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/2010_Chilean_earthquake_causes_icequakes_in_Antarctica_999.html

Un-Science or Non-Science?
Trapped atmospheric waves triggered more weather extremes
By Staff Writers, Potsdam, Germany (SPX) Aug 12, 2014
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Trapped_atmospheric_waves_triggered_more_weather_extremes_999.html
Link to paper: Quasi-resonant circulation regimes and hemispheric synchronization of extreme weather in boreal summer
By Dim Coumou, PNAS, Aug 6, 2014
http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2014/08/06/1412797111.abstract

Global warming is moistening the atmosphere
Human-caused global warming is causing the upper troposphere to become wetter
By John Abraham and Dana Nuccitelli, Guardian, UK, Aug 13, 2014
Link to paper: Upper-tropospheric moistening in response to anthropogenic warming
By Eui-Seok Chunga, et al. PNAS, Jul 28, 2014
http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2014/07/23/1409659111.abstract
[SEPP Comment: More from the falsely claimed 97% -- using models to confirm models. Since the models cannot reliability predict temperature trends, there is no logical reason to assume they can be used to “confirm” other climate parameters.]
Glacier loss of plot
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Aug 15, 2014
Link to paper: Attribution of global glacier mass loss to anthropogenic and natural causes
http://www.sciencemag.org/content/early/2014/08/13/science.1254702
[SEPP Comment: Exposing faulty logic that passes for science in Science magazine.]

Antarctica could raise sea level faster than previously thought
By Staff Writers, Potsdam, Germany, (SPX) Aug 15, 2014
http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Antarctica_could_raise_sea_level_faster_than_previously_thought_999.html
Link to paper: Projecting Antarctic ice discharge using response functions from SeaRISE ice-sheet models
By A. Levermann, et al. Earth System Dynamics, Metrics expected on Aug 17, 2014
[SEPP Comment: Again based on questionable models.]

Lowering Standards
Bad day and black dog
By John Brignell, Number Watch, Aug 13, 2014
http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2014%20August.htm#bad
[SEPP Comment: Brignell devoted much of his professional life to the University of Southampton and the Institute of Physics and finds that the academic standards of both are becoming deplorable.]

Southampton University: We need an air travel regulator with “Teeth”
By Eric Worrall, WUWT, Aug 12, 2014
Link to paper: Direct carbon dioxide emissions from civil aircraft
By Grote, Williams & Preston, Science Direct, Aug 12, 2014
[SEPP Comment: See link immediately above.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?
Be afraid! Trapped atmospheric waves on the rise. Extreme heatwaves to come.
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Aug 14, 2014

How the media distort the news: Lesson 1 — Lies by omission
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Aug 14, 2014

Liberal Media Love Flawed Studies Claiming a Vast Scientific Consensus on Climate
By Julia A. Semour, NewsBusters, Aug 13, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://newsbusters.org/blogs/julia-seymour/2014/08/13/liberal-media-love-flawed-studies-claiming-vast-scientific-consensus-
Climate Change Now Has A Logo
By Laura Dattaro, Weather.com, Aug 9, 2014

It’s Not Warming: The Global Warming Movement is Dying
By Jim Lakely, Somewhat Reasonable, Aug 12, 2014
[SEPP Comment: Having fun with the new logo.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.
Spotting policy-based evidence making
By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Aug 13, 2014

Maria Eagle is talking nonsense about floods and climate change
By Andrew Montford, Spectator, Aug 11, 2014
[SEPP Comment: Exposing unsubstantiated assertions.]

When Did Republicans Start Hating the Environment?
Roughly 1991, according to a new study
By Chris Mooney, Mother Jones, Aug 12, 2014
[SEPP Comment: It is not hating the environment, but opposing the regulations of the agencies that have exceeded their scientific knowledge and their power.]

Global Warming: The Incompetent Politician’s Excuse?
By Eric Worrall, WUWT, Aug 13, 2014

Communicating Better to the Public – Go Personal.
Carter: 'Nutcases' are stopping climate action
By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, Aug 8, 2014
[SEPP Comment: The former president sees “ravages of global warming,” which is no longer occurring.]

It’s an Unsettling Climate for skeptical scientists like Murry Salby
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Aug 14, 2014

Communicating Better to the Public – Use Propaganda on Children
New York Common Core Test Quizzes Kids On Global Warming
By Blake Neff, Daily Caller, Aug 8, 2014 [H/t Tom Sheehen]
**Questioning European Green**
EU green energy laws 'put 1.5m UK manufacturing jobs at risk'
Euro-sceptic group blames Brussels for up to 9pc of costs on manufacturers' energy bills
By Emily Gosden, Telegraph, UK, Aug 13, 2014
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/energy/11029681/EU-green-energy-laws-put-1.5m-UK-manufacturing-jobs-at-risk.html

**EXCLUSIVE: Millions of families to face soaring energy bills**
Families are facing another round of high energy price rises, experts warned last night
By Nathan Rao, Express, UK, Aug 6, 2014 [H/t GWPF]
http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/496037/Millions-face-rise-cost-energy

**Funding Issues**
Billionaire's Club Funds EPA's Fossil Fuel War
By Larry Bell, Newsmax, Aug 11, 2014

Big money flowing in Va. Politics
By Charles Battig, VA-SEEE, Daily Progress, Aug 15, 2014
http://www.dailyprogress.com/opinion/letters_to_the_editor/big-money-flowing-in-va-politics/article_043a31d0-2401-11e4-b97a-0017a43b2370.html

**The Political Games Continue**
Democrats Embracing Shale Boom Ahead of Midterms
By Walter Russell Mead & Staff, American Interest, Aug 12, 2014
http://www.the-american-interest.com/blog/2014/08/12/democrats-embracing-shale-boom-ahead-of-midterms/

Democrats risk Blue-Collar Rebellion
By Joel Kotkin New Geography, Aug 4, 2014
http://www.newgeography.com/content/004455-democrats-risk-blue-collar-rebellion

**Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes**
Mayors Group Scraps Cap-and-Trade Support
The U.S. Conference of Mayors has launched a new campaign to save energy and cut down on air pollution. But, due to GOP opposition, they're no longer urging Congress to pass cap and trade.
By J.B. Wogan, Governing, Jul 8, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

**Subsidies and Mandates Forever**
IRS guidance relaxes renewable energy tax credit
By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, Aug 11, 2014
[SEPP Comment: 3% of the work of a significant nature by the end of 2014 to qualify for tax credit program that supposedly ended in 2013?]

Promoting Parasitic Power Producers
EPA and other Regulators on the March
Congressional Doctors Warn EPA’s CO2 Rule Threatens Public Health
By Megan Tooms, Cornwall Alliance, Aug 13, 2014 [H/t ICECAP]
http://us8.campaign-archive1.com/?u=8fe89cf100dfd0bf13664d610&id=2b9b306883&e=2a0391add7
Link to letter from healthcare professionals who are Member of Congress, March 11, 2014

GAO: EPA Used 20-Year-Old Jobs Data To Justify Regulations
By Michael Bastasch, Daily Caller, Aug 12, 2014

GAO faults cost analyses for EPA regulations
By Benjamin Goad, The Hill, Aug 11, 2014
Link to report:
EPA Should Improve Adherence to Guidance for Selected Elements of Regulatory Impact Analyses
By Staff Writers, GAO, July 2014

EPA must explain the costs of its rules better, federal watchdog says
By Zach Colman, Washington Examiner, Aug 11, 2014

House Republican to EPA: Double-check numbers on climate rule cost
By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, Aug 13, 2014
[SEPP Comment: See links immediately above on the GAO report.]

How the EPA ignores the public and science
By Tom Harris, New York Post, Aug 10, 2014

ITSSD responds to EPA’s power plant rule
By Jonathan Rowland, World Coal, Aug 15, 2014
Link to submission: To EPA, By ITSSD, Aug 13, 2014
http://nebula.wsimg.com/9293ff84df35eeecadd25e73a03499114?AccessKeyId=39A2DC689E4CA87C906D&disposition=0&alloworigin=1

Legal Expert: EPA’s CO2 Rule Violates Federal Data Quality Law
By Michael Bastasch, Daily Caller, Aug 14, 2014
[SEPP Comment: See link immediately above.]

The EPA’s Shoddy Math
The Agency’s cost-benefit reports for new regs just don’t add up.
By Jillian Kay Melchior, National Review, Aug 14, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
[SEPP Comment: The propaganda photo of dark blowing stacks of condensing water vapor undermines the rational arguments made by the author.]

EPA power-plant rule: comments close October 16
By Christopher Monckton, WUWT, Aug 9, 2014

Declare a Ceasefire in EPA's War on Coal
By William F. Shughart II, American Thinker, Aug 11, 2014
http://www.americanthinker.com/2014/08/declare_a_ceasefire_in_epas_war_on_coal.html

EPA moving forward with long-delayed rules to protect fish
By Tim Devaney, The Hill, Aug 14, 2014
Link to new rules: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System—Final Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Existing Facilities and Amend Requirements at Phase I Facilities
[SEPP Comment: Under the Clean Water Act. A three month delay is hardly long-delayed.]

EPA extends comment period on oil refinery regulations
By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Aug 14, 2014

If it's wet, EPA wants to regulate it
By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Aug 12, 2014
[SEPP Comment: Wet leaves can qualify as “waters of the United States.”]

Energy Issues – Non-US
Oil Nationalism Seen Reversing by IEA Amid Shale Boom
By Grant Smith, Bloomberg, Aug 14, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

Short-sighted political populism risks missing shale gas's potential benefits
By Benny Peiser and Daniel Mahoney, City A.M. Aug 15, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

China’s Shale Gas Bust
China is betting long-term on unconventional gas, but it is running into problems developing its vast shale resources.
By Mike Orcuff, MIT Technology Review, Aug 12, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

China outstrips Germany to become world's biggest solar market
By Staff Writers, Beijing (SPX), Aug 12, 2014
http://www.solardaily.com/reports/China_outstrips_Germany_to_become_worlds_biggest_solar_market_999.html

U.S. Anti-coal Dominoes Hit BRICS Wall, Other Skeptics
By Anna Yukhananov and Valerie Volcovici, Reuters, Aug 12, 2014

European Industry Stagnates as Americans Prosper with Fracking
By David Biederman, The Objective Standard, Aug 8, 2014
http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/2014/08/european-industry-stagnates-americans-prosper-fracking/
[SEPP Comment: According to the author, the demise of the chemical industry in Europe is not so much due to the shale boom in the US, but the failure of the EU to allow the development of similar resources in the EU.]

Energy Issues -- US
Coal country forecast to see largest natural gas increases
By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Aug 15, 2014
Link to report: Reasons for projected natural gas-fired generation growth vary by region
By Mike Ford, et al. EIA, Aug 15, 2014
http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=17571

Washington’s Control of Energy
Do Greens Oppose Keystone XL Because It Would Increase Gas Prices or Lower Them? Yes!
By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Aug 14, 2014
http://www.globalwarming.org/2014/08/14/do-greens-oppose-keystone-xl-because-it-would-increase-gas-prices-or-lower-them-yes/#more-21183

Keystone, The Magic Pipeline
Oh goody—dueling studies about the Keystone pipeline! Wonk heaven.
By Steven Hayward, Power Line, Aug 11, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?
Another US energy milestone: US was the world’s largest petroleum producer in April for the 18th straight month
By Mark Perry, AEIdeas, Aug 13, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]
http://www.aei-ideas.org/2014/08/another-us-energy-milestone-us-was-the-worlds-largest-petroleum-producer-in-april-for-the-18th-straight-month/

Nuclear Energy and Fears
Biosphere reserve for Chernobyl
By Staff Writers, WNN, Aug 7, 2014

Crunch time for the EU
By Stephen Tarlton, WNN, Aug 12, 2014
http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/F-Crunch-time-for-the-EU-1208141.html

Don’t mention the Nuclear Option to Greens
By Eric Worrall, WUWT, Aug 9, 2014

EDF Energy says shuts down nuclear reactors in Britain
By Staff Writers, London (AFP), Aug 11, 2014
http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/EDF_Energy_says_shuts_down_nuclear_reactors_in_Britain_999.html

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Solar and Wind
Why Wind Energy is a Bad Idea
By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Aug 12, 2014
https://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/08/12/why-wind-energy-is-a-bad-idea/

Wind farm 'needs 700 times more land' than fracking site to produce same energy
Shale gas site 'creates the least visual intrusion' compared with wind or solar farm for same energy, according to Government's former chief scientific advisor on energy
By Emily Gosden, Telegraph, UK, Aug 14, 2014
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/energy/fracking/11034270/Wind-farm-needs-700-times-more-land-than-fracking-site.html
Link to study: Shale gas in perspective
By David MacKay, Sustainable Energy – without the hot air
http://withouthotair.blogspot.co.uk/2014/08/shale-gas-in-perspective.html

Carbon Schemes
Carbon dioxide 'sponge' could ease transition to cleaner energy
By Staff Writers, San Francisco CA (SPX), Aug 13, 2014
http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Carbon_dioxide_spongecould_ease_transition_to_cleaner_energy_999.html

Halifax firm reusing CO2 to make stronger, greener concrete blocks
"Small but feisty" firm working on new concrete blocks that could actually absorb CO2 from the environment
By David Nesseth , Clean Tech Canada, Aug 8, 2014 [H/toshio Fujita]
Oh Mann!
ACLU, news organizations back National Review, think tank in climate libel case
By Sean Higgins, Washington Examiner, Aug 13, 2014
[SEPP Comment: Will Mr. Mann's legal action be considered a nuisance?]

ACLU and National Media Intervene in Mann v Steyn et al
By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Aug 13, 2014

Global Warming Alarmist Sues Think Tank for Disputing his "Facts"
By Bya Shapiro, Townhall, Aug 13, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

Environmental Industry
Big Green Hypocrites
By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, Aug 9, 2014

Green group looks to 'rebuild trust' with GOP
By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, Aug 15, 2014
[SEPP Comment: We have been engaged in a decades-long campaign demonizing fossil-fuels, which will destroy jobs and make the poor poorer. Why don’t you trust us?]

The hidden persuaders of the environmental elite
By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Aug 5, 2014

Other Scientific News
Extreme space weather threatens to leave the U.S. in the dark

Other News that May Be of Interest
Our sincerest condolences to Dr. John Christy and his family – Alice “Babs” Christy
From the Huntsville Times Obituary Page, WUWT, Aug 11, 2014
Reasons to be fearful about Ebola
This epidemic is not under control
By Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Aug 12, 2014

Airports plant prairie grass to prevent bird strikes
By Brooks Hays, Dayton, Ohio (UPI), Aug 12, 2013
http://www.spacemart.com/reports/Airports_plant_prairie_grass_to_prevent_bird_strikes_999.html

Could renewable energy make rural electrification a reality?
Cheap solar, wind or hydroelectricity accessed through mini-grids could light up remote villages. So what's the problem?
By Frederika Whitehead, Guardian Professional, Aug 6, 2014 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
[SEPP Comment: Why omit fossil fuels? Because they often cost less?]

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:
A Mother Load of Wind Power
Mapping the potential to harvest high-altitude wind
B David Hosansky, NCAR & UCAR Communications, May 28, 2014 [H/t WUWT]
http://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/in-brief/11670/mother-lode-wind-power

Berlin Orchestra Now Donning Rubber Boots To Elevate Awareness Of Dangerous Climate Change
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Aug 14, 2014

ARTICLES:
1. Carbon dioxide keeps the Earth green
Editor, Times-Dispatch: By Fred Singer, VA-SEE, Aug 11, 2014
http://www.timesdispatch.com/opinion/your-opinion/letters-to-the-editor/letters-to-the-editor/article_b7ac6dbb-7795-5107-9315-777a1b07cdf0.html

Your editorial “Ebola in America” tries to draw a false analogy between denial by many West Africans of Ebola’s existence and scientifically based skepticism about significant man-made global warming (presumably due to the release of carbon dioxide by human activity). A better analogy would have been to the denial of the reality of ghosts and demons.

Carbon dioxide is a colorless, non-toxic, non-irritating gas — a natural component of the atmosphere. The Clean Air Act and subsequent amendments do not list carbon dioxide as a pollutant. On the contrary, it is of vital importance for plant growth and the support of all life on Earth. Agricultural crops are starved for carbon dioxide and need more. We should be thanking China for emitting so much into the atmosphere and thereby greening the Earth.

S. Fred Singer, PhD., Chair, Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment.
Arlington.
2. Climate Science Does Not Support IPCC Conclusions
By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Aug 15, 2014
http://americanthinker.com/2014/08/climate_science_does_not_support_ipcc_conclusions.html

[SEPP Comment: The symbol ° became O in the article, which may create some confusion.]

Since 2008, the Chicago-based, libertarian-leaning Heartland Institute has organized nine ICCCs (International Conferences on Climate Change). Norman Rogers (American Thinker, Aug 9, 2014) has given a general overview of ICCC-9 (at Las Vegas), which attracted an audience of well over 600 and featured speakers from 12 nations. Here I present a more detailed and personalized account of the two main science issues that appear to be of general concern. The first has to do with future temperatures and the second has to do with future sea level rise (SLR).

When it comes to global average surface temperature (GAST), the concern seems to be to remain below 2°C. It should be recognized that this limit is entirely arbitrary. There is no established scientific basis for assigning special significance to it; it just happens to be the “Goldilocks” number. Here is what I mean: If one were to choose 0.5°C, people will say “we’ve already seen that and nothing has happened.” However, if we were to choose 5°C, people will say, “we’ll never see that much warming -- hence of no significance.” That is why 2°C may have become the alarmists’ choice.

The real question relates to Climate Sensitivity (CS) -- defined as the temperature rise associated with a doubling of CO2 (The definition varies slightly between different authors.) IPCC initially claimed a very large CS. But after the first Assessment report of 1990, CS dropped from 4.5 to about 2.5°C. From then on, IPCC only considered the last part of the 20th century and no longer claimed the earlier warming (1910-40) to be manmade [see Slide-1].

---

S-1: (a) GAST (Global Ave Surface Temp) (b) Note that max US temp occurred in 1930s Source: GISS
In my view, CS may actually be close to zero. This means CO2 has very little influence on climate change -- probably because of negative feedback. There is still debate, however, about what kind of negative feedback to expect. Should it come from water vapor or from clouds?

1. IPCC’s ever-changing, non-existing evidence for AGW
First, I want to critique IPCC reports #1 (1990) to #5 (2013). As a so-called ‘expert reviewer’ I have enjoyed a unique observation platform for successive IPCC drafts. It is rather amusing that the Summaries talk about increasing certainty for AGW (anthropogenic global warming) -- while at the same time modeled temperatures increasingly diverge from those actually observed [S-2].

\[ S-2: \ \text{IPCC confidence in AGW: 50\%}[1996]; >66\%[2001]; >90\%[2007]; >95\%[2013] \]

-----------
---------------------

First, we note that each report “Summary” is produced by a political consensus, not like the underlying scientific report. [Doubting readers can visit the web site] As Rogers points out, the U.N. mandate is: “understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change…” There is no mandate to consider any other causations, such as natural ones related to solar change and ocean circulation cycles -- just presumptive human causes, such as fossil fuels. The IPCC sees a human climate-fingerprint everywhere because that is what they are looking for.

Specifically, IPCC-AR1 indicates a climate sensitivity of 4.5OC, by considering both reported temperature increases (1910-1940 and 1975-1997) to be anthropogenic [S 1]. After severe criticism of this ‘evidence’, IPCC dropped the climate sensitivity to 2.5OC by considering only the most recent decades of reported global warming as anthropogenic. The earlier warming (1910-1940) is now considered to be caused by natural forcing.

Having given up on anthropogenic forcing for 1910-40, IPCC then considered different types of evidence to support AGW for the interval 1975-2000. In their 1996 report, AR2, Ben Santer “manufactured” the so called Hotspot (HS), a calculated maximum warming of the upper troposphere [S-3], and claimed it as a fingerprint of AGW. This is incorrect on two counts; the HS is not a fingerprint of AGW at all -- and it does not even exist. It was manufactured from the
(balloon-radiosonde) temperature record, where a segment shows a short-term increase while there has been no long-term increase [S-4] as clearly seen from the actual data.

CCSP 1.1 – Chapter 1, Figure 1.3F PCM Simulations of Zonal-Mean Atmospheric Temperature Change

---

**S-3:** Modeled HotSpot in tropical troposphere  
CCSP 1.1 – Chapter 5, Figure 7E

**S-4:** No observed HotSpot

It is worth noting that CCSP 1.1 [2006], the climate change science report of the US government, with Santer as a lead author, shows a in the models [S-3] but no observed HS [S-4]. The disparity between models and observations is striking. It nicely illustrates the major source of scientific disagreement -- between those who rely on model calculations vs those who rely on observations.
In IPCC-AR3 [2001], they no longer use the HS but have gone to Mike Mann's notorious Hockeystick -- claiming that in the past 1000 yrs only the 20th cy showed unusual warming [S-5].

A close examination of the proxy data used in the Hockeystick shows that the warming was not unusual at all and probably less than existed 1000 years ago -- and that major warming comes only by adding the (reported) temperature curve from instruments [S-5]. Note also that Mann suppresses his post-1979 proxy data, which probably showed no such warming. Because of many valid criticisms, the Hockeystick argument has now been dropped by IPCC and is no longer used to claim AGW. Instead both AR4 [2007] and AR5 [2013], in their chapters on ‘Attribution,’ rely on very peculiar circular argument for supporting AGW.

Both reports ‘curve-fit’ a calculated curve to the reported temp data of the second half of the 20th century. [This can always be done by choosing a suitable value of climate sensitivity, and an assumed aerosol forcing]. After having obtained a reasonable fit, they then remove the greenhouse- gas forcing, and of course, obtain an unforced model curve that no longer shows any temp increase (see S-6). But they then claim that this gap with respect to the data is sure evidence for AGW. This claim defies logic and makes absolutely no sense. They simply modified the calculated curve and then claimed that the resultant gap proves anthropogenic warming.
2. SLR (sea level rise) shows no acceleration in 20th century

It is generally accepted that sea level has risen by about 400 feet (120 meters) since the depth of the most recent ice age, about 18,000 years ago. The best values come from coral data in the Caribbean.

The IPCC in its five reports has attempted to estimate SLR expected by the year 2100. As seen in S-7, these estimates have been decreasing, with the lowest values obtained in the draft of AR4 [2007]. However, the final version of AR4 shows slightly larger estimates; apparently, some political pressure was applied, which led to these higher values.
Sea Level Rise to 2100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S-7: SLR estimates by five IPCC reports. AR5 [2013] values (in black) closely match Rahmstorf’s -------------------------------

AR4 [2007] still produces reasonable values for SLR. But by the time AR5 came around, we can see a rough doubling of the lowest and highest estimates – as shown (in black) in S-7. We now look at the summary result (from chapter 13 of AR5) in some detail in S-8 – and pose the crucial question: Is there reliable evidence for acceleration in SLR associated with temp rise and CO2 increase during the 20th century? As we shall see, the answer is NO.

S-8: SLR. Source: IPCC-AR5, Chap 13 (SLR)
The first question one might ask of S-8: why does SLR suddenly accelerate in 1880, going from zero to about 7 inches per century (18cm/cy)? The answer may be that IPCC data does not agree with other data that show no such acceleration.

Next, why is there an acceleration shown at 1993 in S-8? The answer is that IPCC introduced a new observational method, based on Radar from satellites. But as argued by Willie Soon, the new data set is problematic and disagrees with the traditional data from tidal gauges. The latter do not show any acceleration during recent centuries. On the contrary, some tidal-gauge analyses show a deceleration around 1960 [S-9]. The cause is not known but its reality has not been questioned. It certainly disagrees with the more rapid rise reported from satellites.

My best estimate for the year 2100 is a further SL rise of about 15cm [see S-7] and continued rise thereafter of about the same value (18cm/cy) -- independent of any short term temp fluctuations. In my opinion, there is nothing we can do about this natural rise, which will continue until the next Ice Age -- when sea level will drop as ice accumulates in the Polar Regions and on glaciers. Meanwhile, we should follow the Dutch example: relax and build dikes.

---

**S. Fred Singer**

*S. Fred Singer is professor emeritus at the University of Virginia and director of the Science & Environmental Policy Project. His specialty is atmospheric and space physics. An expert in remote sensing and satellites, he served as the founding director of the US Weather Satellite Service and, more recently, as vice chair of the US National Advisory Committee on Oceans & Atmosphere. He is a Senior Fellow of the Heartland Institute and the Independent Institute. He co-authored NY Times best-seller Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1500 years. In 2007, he founded and has chaired the NIPCC (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change), which has released several scientific reports [See www.NIPCCreport.org]. For recent writings see [http://www.americanthinker.com/s_fred_singer/](http://www.americanthinker.com/s_fred_singer/) and also Google Scholar.*
This essay is based on my two talks delivered at ICCC-9 [Int'l Conf. on Climate Change, Las Vegas, 2014], the ninth such conference organized by the Heartland Institute.

3. Electrical Workers vs. the EPA
We union members oppose new anticarbon rules that will cost jobs and endanger the grid.
By Edwin Hill, WSJ, Aug 14, 2014
http://online.wsj.com/articles/edwin-hill-the-electrical-workers-union-vs-the-epa-1408057784

Late last month more than 1,600 witnesses testified at hearings held by the Environmental Protection Agency on its Clean Power Plan, which will impose drastic, 30% cuts in carbon emissions by 2030, with most of the cuts taking place by 2020. The EPA's proposal has attracted such a large response for a very good reason. The plan would have a dramatic impact on the American economy but only a minimal effect on global carbon emissions.

The EPA's plan, according to its own estimates, will require closing coal-fired power plants over the next five years that generate between 41 and 49 gigawatts (49,000 megawatts) of electricity. That's approximately enough capacity to power the state of Georgia at any given time. Unless that capacity is replaced, the nationwide equivalent of the Peach State would go dark.

When gauged by accepted industry metrics, the agency's plans also would result in the loss of some 52,000 permanent direct jobs in utilities, mining and rail and at least another 100,000 jobs in related industries. High-skill, middle-class jobs would be lost, falling heavily in rural communities that have few comparable employment opportunities.

The U.S. is already facing the loss of 60 gigawatts of power over the next three years, the result of older coal plants' being forced to shut down because they cannot comply with the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards enacted in 2012. At the time, the EPA claimed that only four gigawatts of capacity would be lost. Those of us familiar with the industry knew better, and the agency now does not contest that 60 gigawatts of coal-generated electricity will be lost. Ninety percent of the plants slated to close due to the MATS rule were needed to provide power during the polar vortex and other periods of severe weather last winter. Is the EPA willing to gamble that we won't have another harsh winter in the next five years?

The U.S. cannot lose more than 100 gigawatts of power in five years without severely compromising the reliability and safety of the electrical grid. That would pose a danger for the entire economy and all Americans.

Replacing the electricity lost as coal plants are closed will require building or retrofitting facilities powered by other sources, the costs of which will be borne by consumers. Natural gas is the only energy source that could conceivably meet the expected demand over the next five years.

But the market for natural gas is volatile, even with the current abundance resulting from new discoveries. Prices could spike, saddling residential and commercial customers with higher electric bills. Renewables such as solar and wind can't take up the slack. Most industry experts agree that solar and wind technologies will not be capable of producing the required gigawatts for at least 20 years.
There is a better way. The EPA could, for example, provide states with credit for prior reductions in carbon emissions dating back to 2005 instead of setting the baseline for further action at 2012 levels. This would acknowledge the progress that has already been made and build from that.

More important, the agency could develop a more realistic timetable, softening the economic impact of its rules. Delaying the 2020 deadline for the carbon cuts to be in place by several years would allow the industry to test and install new technology enabling some plants to remain in service and still meet emission targets.

The EPA's Clean Power Plan is a classic example of federal tunnel vision—focusing on a single goal with little heed for the costs and dangers. The Obama administration and Congress need to put aside partisan bickering and develop a plan for the nation's energy future that utilizes all of America's abundant sources of power, encourages the development of renewable energy on a large scale and replaces the inevitable lost jobs with new opportunities for a trained, skilled workforce.

Mr. Hill is president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) representing 750,000 members in utilities, construction, railroads, manufacturing, broadcasting, telecommunications and government.

4. The EPA's Latest Threat to Economic Growth
The agency's needless new ozone standard could cost Americans $270 billion annually.
By Jay Timmons, WSJ, Aug 13, 2014
http://online.wsj.com/articles/the-epas-latest-threat-to-economic-growth-1407970689
Link to study: Potential Economic Impacts of a Stricter Ozone Standard,
By Staff Writers, NEPA Economic Consulting, July 2014
http://www.nam.org/~media/29876087653A4D74BFE191551FC024EC.ashx

In a town famous for inaction, Washington is gearing up to take action on a major policy issue. But there's a hitch: The outcome could be the most expensive regulation in the nation's history, possibly tanking the economy and costing jobs at a time when businesses, manufacturers and families are making a comeback.

Later this year, the Environmental Protection Agency will decide whether it should tighten the air-quality standard for ground-level ozone. There are several things about this possible new standard that are alarming.

Just a few years ago, in 2008, the EPA set ozone standards for air quality at 75 parts per billion (ppb). And just recently the second-highest court in the land held that the current standard protects public health.

Yet even before states have fully implemented the 2008 standard, the EPA is expected to propose revising it to as low as 60 ppb. In 2010, the EPA estimated that the annual compliance costs for a 60-ppb standard would be $90 billion in 2020.

But that's a gross underestimation of the potential damage the new standard will do to the U.S. economy. According to a new study for the National Association of Manufacturers by NERA Economic Consulting, the new ozone standard could cost Americans $270 billion annually, put millions of jobs at risk, and drastically increase energy prices for consumers and manufacturers.
No single regulation has come close to rendering this level of self-inflicted and ultimately unnecessary economic pain. Remarkably, the EPA has only identified one-third of the controls and technologies that companies and state governments will need to implement to meet the new standard. The other two-thirds are what the agency refers to as "unknown controls."

However, we do know that the new ozone standard could mean shutting down, scrapping, and modifying power plants, factories, heavy-duty vehicles, farm equipment, off-road vehicles and even passenger cars. Costs would be passed on to consumers, who would have thousands less to spend every year.

The new rule is likely a few months away—yet few understand how the new standard would work, or the aggressiveness of the EPA's approach.

Ground-level ozone is a pollutant that can be formed from the exhaust of cars and trucks, or from the emissions of power plants and factories. But it also occurs naturally, from plants, fires or simply ozone from the stratosphere. Some ozone travels or drifts to the U.S. from countries as far away as China.

Over the past three decades, better technology and a commitment on the part of manufacturing companies to reduce emissions have yielded a considerable decrease in U.S. ozone levels. Even as the economy has expanded, ground-level ozone levels have fallen by 25% since 1980. Manufacturers continue to work to adhere to existing ozone standards, utilizing state-of-the-art equipment and systems such as selective catalytic reduction and low NOX burners to ensure that this downward trend continues.

If a city or county exceeds the EPA's ozone standard, the agency will declare it in "nonattainment." That can essentially ban further economic growth, requiring emissions reductions—either through expensive upgrades or the shutdown of industrial facilities until the ozone levels meet the standard.

At 60 ppb, the progress accomplished by manufacturers and states will be rendered largely irrelevant, as nearly every state in the union will find itself immediately in nonattainment. At levels that low, even America's national parks would be in nonattainment. Under the best of conditions, the standards could be set so low that attainment in areas with no cars or industrial activity would be nearly unachievable.

Now is not the time to sacrifice millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in pursuit of dubious benefits and unreachable targets. The EPA should put on the brakes and allow the existing ozone standards to be implemented.

*Mr. Timmons is the president and CEO of the National Association of Manufacturers.*