Quote of the Week. Beware of false knowledge; it is more dangerous than ignorance. -- George Bernard Shaw [H/t William Readdy]

Number of the Week: Two weeks by 2025

THIS WEEK:

By Ken Haapala, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

California Litigation, Monckton: Last week’s TWTW discussed on the public nuisance lawsuits by San Francisco and Oakland against oil companies claiming carbon dioxide (CO2)-caused global warming / climate change will cause harm in the future. It focused on the filing amicus curiae (friend of the court) brief by three distinguished Professors of Physics – William Happer, Steven Koonin and Richard Lindzen (Three Profs). The brief accepted the data and evidence used by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) and the Climate Science Special Report (CSSR) by the US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). However, the Three Profs demonstrate the conclusions in the reports are not established, and, at best, premature. They assert:

“Our overview of climate science is framed through four statements:

“1. The climate is always changing; changes like those of the past half-century are common in the geologic record, driven by powerful natural phenomena

“2. Human influences on the climate are a small (1%) perturbation to natural energy flows

“3. It is not possible to tell how much of the modest recent warming can be ascribed to human influences

“4. There have been no detrimental changes observed in the most salient climate variables and today’s projections of future changes are highly uncertain.”

Another important assertion is that the procedures (methodology) used by the IPCC and the USGCRP do not yield a unique solution, but an infinite set of solutions. Despite ever more imaginative claims by alarmists declaring CO2 is causing harm, hard evidence is lacking. Claims without evidence by government entities is a common characteristic of what TWTW terms bureaucratic science.

This week’s TWTW will focus on the amicus curiae brief by Christopher Monckton, et al. Then it will briefly discuss the objection raised by Roy Spencer. The importance of Spencer’s objection is not that it refutes the work of Monckton, et al. but it illustrates the morass created by the IPCC, which the IPCC calls science.

Similar to the brief by the Three Profs, Monckton’s amicus curiae brief has the advantage of using the language and concepts of the IPCC and USGCRP, the climate establishment. The brief illustrates a severe error in calculations. If Monckton is correct, the fear of carbon dioxide causing dire global warming is without any theoretical support. Before submission, his work was reviewed by two members of the SEPP Board of Directors, Chairman Tom Sheahen and Willie Soon, as well as others versed in the mathematics and concepts traditionally used by the IPCC.
Monckton’s brief goes to the 1979 Charney Report, published by the National Academy of Sciences, which speculated, without evidence, that the slight warming caused by CO2 will be amplified by a more powerful warming caused by increased water vapor. The warming from CO2 is established by decades of experimentation in many laboratories. The amplification, “positive feedback,” from water vapor has not been found. The concept of positive feedback was introduced in the design of electronics, particularly amplifiers, to carefully and dramatically increase a weak electronic signal. For decades, the concept has been discussed in social sciences, with little precision as to meaning or amplification.

The Charney Report speculated that with a positive feedback from water vapor, a doubling of CO2 would eventually cause an increase in temperatures of 3ºC plus or minus 1.5 ºC. Except for an increase in the lower bound in its 2007 report, the IPCC has continued this speculated estimate for over 25 years, since its first report in 1990. In its influential Second Assessment Report (SAR or AR2, 1996) the IPCC declared the amplified warming was a “hot spot” centered over the tropics at about 33,000 feet (10 km) and incorrectly termed it the “distinct human fingerprint.” The IPCC continued the “hot-spot” to the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4, 2007), which was very influential for the UK to adopt its very expensive energy policy under its Climate Change Act, 2008. Almost forty years of atmospheric temperature data from satellites covering the surface to 50,000 feet (15 km), fail to reveal the “hot spot.” The concept should be relegated to one of the many, very expensive IPCC myths.

Monckton takes the concept embodied in the Charney Report, uses a classic feedback model from electrical circuitry, then calculates what would be the expected warming from a doubling of CO2, if the feedback concept were correctly used. Monckton, et al. calculate a value of 1.2 ºC – less than one half of that used by the IPCC and the Climate Establishment. Monckton finds a serious error in the calculation of a positive feedback as stated in the Charney Report. It should be noted that the Charney Report did not contain the calculations from the modelers on which its speculative findings were based. Also, at the time, the method for calculating global temperatures from atmospheric data had not been established. See Links under Challenging the Orthodoxy and Litigation Issues – California.

Two Languages, Two Sciences? In criticizing the approach used by Monckton, Spencer states that the approach used is no longer used by modelers. In introducing Monckton’s rebuttal, Spencer writes:

“In fairness to Lord Monckton, I have accepted his request to respond to my post where I criticized his claim than an “elementary error of physics” could be demonstrated on the part of climate modelers. While Christopher & I are in agreement that the models produce too much warming, we disagree on the reasons why. From what I can tell, Christopher claims that climatologists have assumed the theoretical 255K average global surface temperature in the absence of the greenhouse effect would actually induce a feedback response; I disagree... 255K is the theoretical, global average temperature of the Earth without greenhouse gases but assuming the same solar insolation and albedo. It has no feedback response because it is a pure radiative equilibrium calculation. Besides, the climate models do not depend upon that theoretical construct anyway; it has little practical value — and virtually no quantitative value —other than in conceptual discussions (how could one have clouds without water vapor? How could a much colder Earth have no more ice cover than today?). But I will let the reader decide whether his arguments have merit. I do think the common assumption that the climate system was in
equilibrium in the mid-1800s is a dubious one, and I wish we could attack that, instead, because if some of the warming since the 1800s was natural (which I believe is likely) it would reduce estimates of climate sensitivity to increasing carbon dioxide even further.”

The issue raised illustrates that there may be a significant divergence in the IPCC Climate Establishment between the concepts used by the modelers and the concepts used by the management. The management issues the assessment reports that claim a great deal of certainty in their work, regardless of how ill-founded. The modelers may be far less certain. Explaining atmospheric energy flows creates difficulties for the modelers and is avoided by management.

Spencer’s dissertation advisor was a pioneer in numerical weather forecasting, Verner Suomi. [Suomi was Chairman of the Climate Research Board, which oversaw the “Ad Hoc Study Group on Carbon Dioxide and Climate”, the Charney Report.] Based on his background, Spencer is probably more attuned to the problems of numerical weather forecasting and of using weather models to make long-range climate forecasts than most establishment climate scientists. Perhaps, explaining why Spencer left the IPCC.

One of the subordinate issues involved in Spencer-Monckton discourse is the search for ZOD – Zero-order model of feedbacks in the climate. A time in which the earth’s climate was stable. The ‘Three Profs” called this the starting point. Given the internal turbulence in the climate system, there is no logical reason to assume ZOD exists – a time in which there were no feedbacks in the climate system. However, given that decades of IPCC reports assert that ZOD existed in the mid-19th century, it is appropriate to assess how well-established it is, and how well it is described. This Monckton did, and found that, given ZOD, the warming power of CO2 was expanded using faulty logic. It is less than one-half of that used by the IPCC.

Please note that in closing his foreword to the Charney Report, Suomi writes:

“In cooperation with other units of the National Research Council, the Climate Research Board expects to continue review and assessment of this important issue in order to clarify further the scientific questions involved and the range of uncertainty in the principal conclusions. We hope that this preliminary report covering but one aspect of this many-faceted issue will prove to be a constructive contribution to the formulation of national and international policies.” [Boldface added.]

It is past time for the National Research Council and the National Academies to review the issue using comprehensive atmospheric temperature data that did not exist when the report was written. Unfortunately, they fail to do so and repeat mistakes of the past.

Next week, TWTW will discuss the testimony by Myles Allen, the expert witness for the cities of San Francisco and Oakland, and a major player in the IPCC. See links under Challenging the Orthodoxy, Defending the Orthodoxy, and http://www.ecd.bnl.gov/steve/charney_report1979.pdf

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

State of the Climate: The Global Warming Policy Foundation published a report by Ole Humlum, a former Professor of Physical Geography at the University Centre in Svalbard, Norway, and Emeritus Professor of Physical Geography, University of Oslo, Norway. His views are particularly interesting because Svalbard is an isolated island between Norway and the North Pole, and one of the world’s northernmost inhabited areas, lying above the Arctic Circle, at a
latitude between 74° and 81° North (Though not precisely fixed, the Arctic Circle runs about 66° North.)

Over the last decade or so we have been bombarded by claims of unprecedented Arctic warming. Among his findings; Humlum states:

“Arctic and Antarctic sea ice extent since 1979 have exhibited opposite trends, decreasing and increasing, respectively. Superimposed on these overall trends, however, variations of shorter duration are also important to understand year-to-year variations. In the Arctic, a 5.3-year periodic variation is important, while for the Antarctic a variation of about 4.5 years’ duration is important. Both of these variations reached their minima simultaneously in 2016, which explains the minimum in global sea ice extent. A shift towards larger ice extents in both hemispheres may have begun in 2017 (Figure 34), as predicted in ‘State of the Climate 2016’. vii

“The Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent has undergone important local and regional variations from year to year. The overall tendency since 1972, however, is towards overall stable snow extent conditions.”

Also, Humlum finds that the recent 2016 & 2017 warming was driven by an El Niño event and states:

“The recent 2015–16 oceanographic El Niño episode is among the strongest since the beginning of the record in 1950. Considering the entire record, however, recent variations between El Niño and La Niña episodes are not unusual.”

In addition, he states:

“There still appears to be a systematic difference between average global air temperatures estimated by surface stations and by satellites. Especially since 2003, the average global temperature estimate derived from surface stations has steadily drifted away from the satellite-based estimate in a warm direction.”

See link under Challenging the Orthodoxy.

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

Ultimate Bureaucratic Science: The IPCC and the USGCRP ignore atmospheric temperature data, taken where the greenhouse effect occurs, in favor of surface data, which has many more influences unrelated to greenhouse gases. This deliberate ignorance is too typical of government bureaucracies that place political policy over rigorous science. The EPA has taken bureaucratic science to an even greater level, by issuing regulations without any scientific justification, just claiming that the scientific justification exists but the bureaucracy cannot reveal it. This is like playing a shell game of finding a pea covered by a shell, but without the pea. It is perfect for bureaucrats who do not wish to be criticized for using shoddy science to establish regulations.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal, Steve Milloy of Junk Science.com, exposes this shell game, calling it “secret science.” The claim that fine particulate matter less than 2.5 microns, PM2.5 (soot), damages human health, began with the Clinton administration in the 1990s, was largely ignored by the Bush administration, then became important to Mr. Obama’s Power Plan. Current EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, has declared “secret science” will not be used in EPA regulations.
Of course, former EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy, under Mr. Obama, objects claiming: "This approach would undermine the nation’s scientific credibility…” Scientific credibility is built on secrecy? Transparency and reproducibility are contrary to rigorous science?

Others object to Mr. Milloy’s analysis, it is not conclusive or too limited. However, all they must do is produce more rigorous science showing that PM2.5 damages human health, which EPA claimed it had. Complicating matters, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the World Health Organization (WHO) have declared PM2.5 to be deadly human carcinogens categorized as: “Group 1: carcinogenic to humans: There is enough evidence to conclude that it can cause cancer in humans.”

Thus far, there appears to be no studies independent of EPA secret science to make a conclusion that PM2.5 causes cancer in humans. Is this what former EPA officials call “undermining the nation’s scientific credibility”? It will be interesting to see how this issue develops. See Article #2 and links under Change in US Administrations.

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

**Does Trump Care?** Roger Pielke Jr. who has been attacked by members of Congress for questioning false claims of intensifying extreme weather events, suggests that President Trump does not care about the integrity of science. Pielke argues that the failure to appoint a director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), which has about 50 staffers, is an example of Trump’s lack of concern.

This may be true. Until there is an appropriate director of OSTP, the USGCRP will continue to be bureaucratic and churn out reports based on inadequately tested models, using inappropriate data, as it recently did with an interim report. The thirteen government entities with representatives in the USGCRP will continue this bureaucratic science. For example, the Department of Agriculture web site ignores the great benefits of enhanced carbon dioxide has on greening of the earth, and increased crop productivity as demonstrated by Landsat images and numerous studies discussed by CO2 Science. It is as if the Department of Agriculture does not understand the science of photosynthesis.

If Mr. Trump wishes to drain the scientific swamp, he needs to start with the OSTP. See links under Change in US Administrations and Review of Recent Scientific Articles by CO2 Science.

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

**Number of the Week: Two weeks by 2025.** The European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), perhaps the finest in forecasting of all groups using numerical weather models, states on its web site:

“Skill in medium-range weather predictions in 2016, on average, extends to about one week ahead. By 2025 the goal is to make skillful ensemble predictions of high-impact weather up to two weeks ahead.”

In a process called re-analysis, the ECMWF constantly tests its predictions and models against actual atmospheric observations, gathered daily. Yet, the IPCC and the USGCRP claim their models using similar techniques can predict / forecast / project future climate 100 years hence – without testing the models against actual atmospheric observations. Pure Bureaucratic Science. See link under Changing Weather.

***************
Commentary: Is the Sun Rising?
Historic Solar Minimum Fast Approaching…Sun Is Blank Already for 51st Day in 2018
The sun is blank today for the 10th day in a row and has been blank 57% of the time this year; courtesy spaceweather.com, NOAA, NASA
By Paul Dorian, Vencore, Inc. Mar 29, 2018 [H/t GWPF]

The Sun Is Spitting Out Strange Patterns of Gamma Rays—and No One Knows Why
The discovery, although mysterious, might provide a new window into the depths of our most familiar star
By Shannon Hall, Scientific American, Mar 28, 2018 [H/t GWPF]
Link to preprint of paper: Astrophysics > High Energy Astrophysical Phenomena
Evidence for a New Component of High-Energy Solar Gamma-Ray Production
By Tim Linden, et al. arXiv.org, Mar 14, 2018
https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.05436

Challenging the Orthodoxy -- NIPCC
Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science
Idso, Carter, and Singer, Lead Authors/Editors, 2013
https://www.heartland.org/media-library/pdfs/CCR-II/CCR-II-Full.pdf
Summary: http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/ccr2a/pdf/Summary-for-Policymakers.pdf

Climate Change Reconsidered II: Biological Impacts
Idso, Idso, Carter, and Singer, Lead Authors/Editors, 2014
Summary: https://www.heartland.org/media-library/pdfs/CCR-IIb/Summary-for-Policymakers.pdf

Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming
The NIPCC Report on the Scientific Consensus
http://climatechangereconsidered.org/
Download with no charge

Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate
S. Fred Singer, Editor, NIPCC, 2008

Challenging the Orthodoxy
Global warming on trial and the elementary error of physics that caused the global warming scare
By Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, WUWT, Mar 19, 2018
Judge in #ExxonKnew case accepts amicus brief exposing climatology’s grave error
By Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, WUWT, Mar 27, 2018

Lord Monckton Responds
By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Mar 23, 2018
http://www.drroyspencer.com/2018/03/lord-monckton-responds/

Legal submission by Happer, Koonin, and Lindzen in
The People of the State of California, v. B.P. P.L.C., et al., US District Court, Northern District of California, Filed Mar 19, 2018
http://1ggye33lc4653z56mp34pl6t.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Tutorial-Professor-Presentation.pdf

Climate Tutorial: Happer, Koonin, Lindzen (climate alarmism on trial)
By Robert Bradley Jr. Master Resource, Mar 28, 2018
https://www.masterresource.org/debate-issues/climate-alarmism-reconsidered/
[SEPP Comment: Includes significant quotes from the tutorial.]

State of the Climate Report Reveals 23-Year Temperature Pause in the Stratosphere
By Staff Writers, GWPF, Mar 27, 2018
Link to report: State of the Climate 2017
By Ole Humlum, GWPF, 2018

Thin sunscreen layer to *save reef from bleaching* for first time in twenty million years
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Mar 27, 2018
“Coral reefs first became widespread about 200 million years ago. It takes some kind of delusional hubris to think they suddenly can’t survive without human help, or that we have any idea what we are doing messing with a complex well developed system.”

Maybe 'exceptional' weather is just weather
By Anthony J. Sadar, American Thinker, Mar 26, 2018
https://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2018/03/maybe_exceptional_weather_is_just_weather.html

Meet Vaclav Smil, the man who has quietly shaped how the world thinks about energy
By Paul Voosen, Science, Mar 21, 2018 [H/t Don Bogard]
“But Smil is not simply a naysayer. He accepts the sobering reality of climate change—though he is dubious of much climate modeling—and believes we need to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels.”

The Stunning Statistical Fraud Behind The Global Warming Scare
Editorial, IBD, Mar 29, 2018

Why Climate Alarmism Will Probably Have to Really Hurt People before They Are Likely to Abandon This Nonsense
By Alan Carlin, Carlin Economics and Science, Mar 30, 2018
http://www.carlineconomics.com/archives/4301
[SEPP Comment: In times of prolonged regional bad weather, on site fuel storage can be important.]

Defending the Orthodoxy
Leaked draft summary of UN special report on 1.5C climate goal – in full
Read the draft summary for policymakers of the most important climate science report of the year, on the challenge of holding global warming to 1.5C
By Megan Darby, Climate Home News, Feb 13, 2018 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
Link: IPCC special report on 1.5C - draft summary for policymakers
By Myles Allen, et al. IPCC, Jan 8, 2018
https://www.scribd.com/document/371415321/IPCC-special-report-on-1-5C-draft-summary-for-policymakers?secret_password=xlexc6WYfplQn1LVaDe#from_embed

Link to transcript: People of California v. Oil Companies, Mar 21, 2018
Understanding how carbon dioxide emissions from human activity contribute to global climate change
MYLES ALLEN Environmental Change Institute, School of Geography and the Environment & Department of Physics University of Oxford myles.allen@ouce.ox.ac.uk

The Climate Is Changing For Climate Skeptics
As climate litigation heats up, a judge’s climate science tutorial puts the fossil fuel industry in an awkward position with the science deniers it once funded.
By Amy Westervelt, Huff Post, Mar 23, 2018 [H/t Clyde Spencer]
https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/climate-change-trial-california_us_5ab53d0ce4b054d118e2a0d9
[SEPP Comment: Rejecting government funded reports that are substantiated by global climate models that have not be properly tested, makes one a science denier?]

Questioning the Orthodoxy
Carbon Taxes and Damage Thresholds in the Presence of Pre-Existing Regulations
By Ross McKitrick, University of Guelph, Can, Mar 13, 2018
EarthHour: largest global movement for environment. “Millions participate” and like every carbon scheme, nothing happens
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Mar 26, 2018

Nothing Unusual Happening in Climate Change, Over 40 New Scientific Papers Confirm
By James Delingpole, Brietbart, Mar 26, 2018 [H/t Paul Homewood]

After Paris!
The Paris Climate Agreement – promises, promises
By Roger Andrews, Energy Matters, Mar 26, 2018
http://euanmearns.com/the-paris-climate-agreement-promises-promises/#more-21223

#ParisAgreement climate accord fails – CO2 emissions growing worldwide- Trump vindicated for pulling out
By David Wallace-Wells, WUWT, Mar 26, 2018

China says it has met 2020 climate goal
By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Mar 27, 2018
http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/380437-china-says-it-has-met-2020-climate-goal
[SEPP Comment: Which country will state that they did not?]

Global CO2 Emissions Rise after Paris Climate Agreement Signed
Emissions climbed in Asia and Europe, but declined in the U.S.
By Benjamin Storrow, E&E News, Mar 24, 2018

Remember when we had to reduce CO2 emissions to zero to save the planet? NCAR says – Never mind.
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 26, 2018

Change in US Administrations
Donald Trump isn’t waging war on science. He just doesn’t care
By Roger Pielke Jr, The Guardian, Mar 21, 2018

Greens launch campaign to get Pruitt fired
By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Mar 28, 2018
Ex-EPA heads: Pruitt is crippling agency with 'secret science' rule
By Miranda Green, The Hill, Mar 27, 2018

Social Benefits of Carbon Dioxide
Carbon Dioxide Is Mostly Oxygen, People: Deceptive Language Ruins Earth Hour
By Tom Harris, Daily Caller, Mar 23, 2018

Problems in the Orthodoxy
As Karakorum Glacier Stability Puzzles Global Warming Experts, The Scientific Excuses Start To Fly
Karakorum glaciers ignore the command to melt: Reason may be due to vortex, or irrigation, or…
By Dr. Sebastian Lüning and Prof. Fritz Vahrenholt, (German text translated/edited by P Gosselin), No Tricks Zone, Mar 27, 2018
“Awhile back a number of scientists hopped on the bandwagon claim that the Himalayan glaciers would be gone by the year 2030 [2035?]. That claim was quickly exposed as being preposterous and so the red-faced scientists backed off and said they had in fact meant the year 2300. Today that figure as well is also looking fake.”
[SEPP Comment: From this, we are to be assured of the “certainty” of IPCC science?]

Climate Change, Catastrophe, Regulation and the Social Cost of Carbon
By Julian Morris, Reason Foundation, Mar 2018
Federal agencies are required to calculate the costs and benefits of new regulations that have significant economic effects. Since a court ruling in 2008, agencies have included a measure of the cost of greenhouse gas emissions when evaluating regulations that affect such emissions. This measure is known as the “social cost of carbon” (SCC).
[SEPP Comment: Apparently, the author refers to the Supreme Court 2008 decision, which made no such ruling. The SCC was later established by the Obama administration.]

Estimation of the year-on-year volatility and the unpredictability of the United States energy system
By Sherwin, Henrion & Aevendo, Nature Energy, March 26, 2018
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41560-018-0121-4
[SEPP Comment: Prediction is difficult.]

Seeking a Common Ground
Would Albert Einstein be a global warming skeptic? Yes
Einstein’s long career was filled with the pithy quotes of a skeptic
By Will Happer, The Denver Post, Mar 16, 2018

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by CO2 Science
Vitamin C Concentration in Spinach is Enhanced by Elevated CO2
http://www.co2science.org/articles/V21/mar/a18.php

**The Interactive Effects of Elevated CO2 and Low Light Intensity on Hot Pepper**
http://www.co2science.org/articles/V21/mar/a17.php

“Given these several findings, it would appear that rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations will lead to important yield and water use efficiency increases in hot pepper, even under low light intensities.”

[SEPP Question: Does increased CO2 increase the growing season?]

**The Impact of Ocean Acidification on the Pearl Oyster**
http://www.co2science.org/articles/V21/mar/a16.php

“Dissolution of atmospheric CO2 into the surface waters of the world's oceans is believed to have caused a slight decline in seawater pH of 0.1 unit over the past two centuries; and it is projected that future CO2 emissions -- if left unchecked -- could cause an additional decline of up to 0.3 pH units by the end of this century, a phenomenon referred to as ocean acidification. The impacts of this possibility, however, remain highly debated and a key topic of scientific inquiry.”

**Models v. Observations**

**Prediction FactCheck: Consensus Experts & Climate Models Predicted Higher CO2 Levels Would Result In More Forest Fires**
By Staff Writers, C3 headlines, Mar 25, 2018

**Model Issues**

**Emergent constraints on climate sensitivity in global models. Part III**
By Nic Lewis, Climate Etc. Mar 29, 2018

**Emergent constraints on climate sensitivity in global climate models, Part 3**
The two strongest potentially credible constraints, and conclusions
By Nic Lewis, Climate Audit, Mar 29, 2018

**Another Bust: PAGES 2k ‘Global’ Reconstruction Fails To Confirm The ‘Hockey Stick’**
By Kenneth Richard, No Tricks Zone, Mar 29, 2018
“Five years ago, the release of the PAGES 2k Consortium (2013) “global” temperature data set was accompanied by a great deal of fanfare. “Advocates deemed the conglomeration of proxy temperature data from 7 land regions as scientific confirmation of the notorious hockey-stick-shaped temperature reconstruction popularized by Michael Mann and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, TAR) in the early 2000s.”

[SEPP Comment: Previously, Steve McIntyre exposed faults in PAGES 2k, as he had discussed the Mann hockey-stick. The “corrections” created more faults.]

**New “simplified” Russian climate model promises faster results**
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 28, 2018
Link to paper: The dynamical core of the Aeolus 1.0 statistical–dynamical atmosphere model: validation and parameter optimization
By Totz, Eliseev, Petri, Flechsig, Caesar, Petoukhov, Coumou, Geoscientific Model Development, Feb 22, 2018

[SEPP Comment: It uses a statistical-dynamic approach on the influence of CO2 on temperatures. That may lead to testable results sooner than global climate models. However, they use ER-Interim reanalysis data to tune (adjust) their models.)

**Measurement Issues -- Surface**
**Temperature trends with reduced impact of ocean air temperature**
By Frank Lansner, Jens Olaf Pepke Pedersen, Energy and Environment, Mar 21, 2018

Where The Warmth Is
Guest Post by Willis Eschenbach, WUWT, Mar 24, 2018 [H/t Don Bogard]
[https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/03/24/where-the-warmth-is/](https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/03/24/where-the-warmth-is/)

How Not To Model The Historical Temperature
Guest Post by Willis Eschenbach, WUWT, Mar 24, 2018 [H/t Don Bogard]

**Changing Weather**
The European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF)
The Strength of a Common Goal: A Roadmap to 2025 Accessed Mar 28, 2018
[https://www.ecmwf.int/sites/default/files/ECMWF_Roadmap_to_2025.pdf](https://www.ecmwf.int/sites/default/files/ECMWF_Roadmap_to_2025.pdf)

@weatherchannel – The realization of a dream
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 22, 2018

[SEPP Comment: Review of a book by Joe D’Aleo and the late John Coleman.]

La Nina is Doomed
By Cliff Mass, Weather and Climate Blog, Mar 29, 2018
Changing Climate – Cultures & Civilizations
Study: Ancient Britons Thrived Despite Rapid Climate Swings
By Guest essay by Eric Worrall, WUWT, Mar 27, 2018

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice
Snow Cover, Ice Volume Growth Show Global Climate Is A Lot More Than Just “Surface Temperature”
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Mar 30, 2018

Changing Earth
Two-billion-year-old salt rock reveals rise of oxygen in ancient atmosphere
By Catherine Zandonella, Office of the Dean for Research, Princeton University, Mar 22, 2018
[H/t Toshio Fujita]
Link to paper: Two-billion-year-old evaporites capture Earth’s great oxidation,
By C.L. Blättler, et al. Science, Mar 22, 2018
http://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2018/03/21/science.aar2687

Un-Science or Non-Science?
A fish story: climate change bigger threat to lakes than predator fish
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 23, 2018
Link to paper: Context-dependent interactions and the regulation of species richness in freshwater fish
By Andrew S. MacDougall, et al, Nature, Communications, Mar 6, 2018
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-03419-1

Lowering Standards
An embarrassment to science: BioScience editor formally rejects retraction request
By Susan Crockford, Polar Bear Science, Mar 26, 2018

BBC Regrets Climate Error and Failure to Meet Usual Standards of Reporting – Then Does It Again
By David Whitehouse, GW[F. Mar 26, 2018

NOAA Data Tampering Approaching 2.5 Degrees
By Tony Heller, The Deplorable Climate Science Blog, Mar 20, 2018
Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?
Palm Trees in Canada? It Could Happen, Thanks to Climate Change
By Michele Debczak, Mental Floss, Mar 21, 2018 [H/t Energy Matters]
Link to paper: The relation between global palm distribution and climate
By Reichgelt, West, & Greenwood, Scientific Reports, Mar 16, 2018
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-23147-2

Ocean Acidification: Meeting Focuses on Impacts and Adaptation Strategies in Latin America
By Sarah Jones Couture, IAEA, Mar 30, 2018
“Below a certain pH, there is a decrease in the levels of calcium carbonate in the water, which is one of the main elements many sea organisms use to grow. As organisms are more sensitive in early life stages, some would not survive to adulthood and some species populations could decrease, such as mussels and oysters.”
[SEPP Comment: The lack of clarity in the science: below what pH?]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.
Did Adam Scaife Lie About The Beast From The East?
By Paul Homewood, Not a Lot of People Know That, Mar 29, 2018
“Readers will recall the story from a few weeks ago, about how Adam Scaife, head of long-range forecasting at the Met Office, claimed to have briefed the Cabinet Office about the Beast from the East in early February.”
“If Scaife has given false information to the press, in order to cover his own back and embarrass the government, his position now is surely untenable. There are clearly questions to be answered now.”

New Extreme Weather Claims Based On Flawed Data
By Paul Homewood, Not a Lot of People Know That, Mar 24, 2018 [H/t John Dunn]

Questioning European Green
Germany’s green energy shift is more fizzle than sizzle
Despite spending billions, it is falling behind other European countries.
By Kalina Oroschakoff, Politico, Mar 27, 2018
https://www.politico.eu/article/germany-climate-change-green-energy-shift-is-more-fizzle-than-sizzle/
“Despite spending about €150 billion and years of political effort to scrap nuclear and fossil fuels and switch to renewables like wind and solar, Germany is expected to fall short on pretty much all its national and EU emission reduction and clean energy targets for 2020.”

Fossil Fuel Consumption In Germany Still Higher Than 2009
By Paul Homewood, Not a Lot of People Know That, Mar 29, 2018
Germany Proves That Burning Money On Green Energies Does Not Reduce CO2 Emissions...”Bitter Result”
German CO2 equivalent emissions refuse to budge 10 straight years running, despite hundreds of BILLIONS invested in green energies.
By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Mar 28, 2018
http://notrickszone.com/2018/03/28/germany-proves-that-burning-money-on-green-energies-does-not-reduce-co2-emissions-bitter-result/#sthash.kPZwO0O6.dpbs

Litigation Issues
Judge dismisses Exxon’s ‘implausible’ attempt to stop climate investigations
By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Mar 29, 2018
[SEPP Comment: The judge in the US District Court for the Southern District of New York, was asked to dismiss Exxon’s counter-suit of a suit by the New York Attorney General.]

Court knocks down climate analysis in BLM oil, coal plans
By Ellen M. Gilmer, E&E, News, Mar 26, 2018
https://www.eenews.net/energywire/2018/03/26/stories/1060077391
“The U.S. District Court for the District of Montana on Friday ruled that the Bureau of Land Management failed to fully factor in climate change in resource management plans (RMPs) for the Powder River Basin — an area of Wyoming and Montana that is flush with coal, oil and gas.”
[SEPP Comment: Time to be rid of the Obama Administration policy.]

Litigation Issues -- California
All the “tutorial”, reference, and amicus brief documents for the #ExxonKnew federal court case
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 23, 2018

Klimate Kraziness: A California Judge Holds A "Tutorial" On Climate Science
By Francis Menton, Manhattan Contrarian, Mar 24, 2018

A postmortem on the rejected #ExxonKnew case in San Francisco Federal Court
Guest opinion by Joseph Bast, WUWT, Mar 23, 2018

Climate Sophistry In San Francisco; Half-Truths are Twice the Lie
By Staff Writers, CO2 is Life, Mar 24, 2018
https://co2islife.wordpress.com/2018/03/24/sophistry-in-san-francisco-half-truths-are-twice-the-lie/
Warmism Gets a Courtroom Thrashing
By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, AU, Mar 29, 2018

White House's John Kelly, Chevron officials are the new Al Gores
By Luboš Motl, The Reference Frame, Mar 26, 2018
https://motls.blogspot.com/2018/03/white-houses-john-kelly-chevron.html
“Science shouldn't be done in public debates. The public knows a little. But secretive science in the ivory tower only works when the people in the ivory tower are both smart and impartial. In the science about the anthropogenic climate change, the second condition is surely violated and the first one is mostly violated, too. This field needs a lot of new eyes. There are lots of intelligent people who should look into these problems and the new participants should improve the situation because some really bad things have taken place in the climate science itself.”
[SEPP Comment: Apparently, Motl did not appreciate the trap laid for Oakland and San Francisco officials and city bond holders.]

Energy Issues – Non-US
German Electricity Exports and the European Internal Energy Market
By John Constable, GWPF, Mar 23, 2018
“While of comparable scale, there are major differences between the dominant exporters. France transmits a high value, low cost, despatchable product from its nuclear power stations, and chooses to do so. Germany exports because of its policy decisions to support lignite and renewables, and electricity from the latter is a low value surplus of domestically subsidised renewable electricity that is necessarily exported,”
[SEPP Comment: Stop electricity dumping!]

AFPM 2018: Former UK PM Cameron remains optimistic for British fracking
By Phillipe Craig, Platts, Mar 27, 2018
[SEPP Comment: As the article states, feedstocks needed for plastics are much cheaper in the US than the UK, thanks to hydraulic fracturing.]

Energy Issues – Australia
Surprise: Australia closed a cheap coal generator and electricity got 85% more expensive
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Mar 29, 2018
[SEPP Comment: Replacing a brown coal-fired plant costs consumers.]

Another way to destroy a grid: add a million electric vehicles
By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Mar 28, 2018

Tesla claims it's being shortchanged for providing power too quickly
By Cole Latimer, Brisbane Times, Mar 21, 2018 [H/t Energy Matters]
Energy Issues -- US
America's Next Energy Crisis
By Charles McConnell, Forbes, Jul 10, 2017
“Perhaps the bigger concern is the ‘magical thinking’ behind some analysis trying to wish our electricity system into resiliency and reliability without these traditional base-load power plants. It can be uncomfortable to face facts honestly.”

[SEPP Comment: The assistant secretary of energy for fossil energy during the Obama Administration from 2011 to 2013 expresses his concerns of the future of reliable electricity.]

Can The U.S. Break Russia’s Gas Monopoly In Europe?
By Tim Daiss, Oil Price.com, Mar 26, 2018
“Economic factors also come into play. As discussed last week, American LNG is at a cost disadvantage compared to Russian piped gas. Using a Henry Hub gas price of $2.85/MMBtu as a base, Gazprom recently estimated that adding processing and transportation costs, the price of U.S.-sourced LNG in Europe would reach $6/MMBtu or higher – a steep markup.”

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes
A billion-dollar plan no one should follow
Guest opinion by Tom Harris, WUWT, Mar 24, 2018
https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/03/24/a-billion-dollar-plan-no-one-should-follow/
[SEPP Comment: Is it time to tax breathing?]

“Carbon trading” in the EU fails, emissions on the rise again.
By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Mar 27, 2018

Washington’s Control of Energy
Right Reforms for Accessing U.S. Outer Continental Shelf Resources and Unleashing U.S. Energy Production
By Nicolas Loris, Heritage Foundation, Mar 26, 2018

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?
More oil and gas uncovered offshore Norway
By Daniel J. Graeber, Washington (UPI), Mar 26, 2018
http://www.oilgasdaily.com/reports/More_oil_and_gas_uncovered_offshore_Norway_999.html

Return of King Coal?
Stop the Bleeding. Preserve the Coal Fleet.
By Matthew Kandrach, Real Clear Energy, March 28, 2018
https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2018/03/28/stop_the_bleeding_preserve_the_coal_fleet_110282.html
Indian power plants starved of fuel
By Stephanie Roker, World Coal, Mar 23, 2018 [H/t Dennis Ambler]
https://www.worldcoal.com/power/23032018/indian-power-plants-starved-of-fuel/

Coal production up thanks to exports
By Fred Pace, Herald-Dispatch, Huntington, WV, Mar 25, 2018 [H/t GWPF]

Nuclear Energy and Fears
Energy return on energy invested and the promise of fusion
Unlimited cheap energy would transform society
By Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Mar 26, 2018
http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/nuclear-fusion/

Swiss reopen world’s oldest nuclear plant after repairs
By Staff Writers, AFP, Mar 20, 2018 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

Why the Environmental Left Is Secretly Petrified by Truly Renewable Energy
By Justin Haskins, American Thinker, Mar 28, 2018
https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2018/03/why_the_environmental_left_is_secretly_petri
fied_by_truly_renewable_energy.html

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Solar and Wind
Energy Externalities Day 7: Solar Photovoltaics
By Euan Mearns, Energy Matters, Mar 29, 2018
http://euanmearns.com/energy-externalities-day-7-solar-photovoltaics/
“Politicians tend to see devices that generate free, clean electricity, while I tend to see expensive
devices made from coal in China that produce electricity some of the time.”

Microsoft buying power from 750,000 solar panels
Company says it’s the largest corporate solar deal in U.S. history
By Todd Bishop, GeekWire, Mar 21, 2018
https://www.seattlepi.com/business/tech/article/Microsoft-buying-power-from-750-000-solar-
panels-12772358.php
“With the deal, the company says it has successfully reached its target of powering 50 percent of
its data centers worldwide with renewables.
“Its next target is 60 percent renewables by 2020.”
[SEPP Comment: Strongly doubt these will provide needed electricity at least 50% of the time.]

This Florida City Is 100% Solar-Powered
About 343,000 sun-hungry panels fuel Babcock Ranch, where residents are just starting to move in.
By Jane Yeomans, Bloomberg, Mar 23, 2018
[SEPP Comment: Great photos, little discussion, particularly how a community of about 19,500
homes can be powered solely by solar – are the residents awake only at mid-day?]
Wind Turbines May Grow Twice as Tall
By Ben Webster, The Times, Via GWPF, Mar 27, 2018
https://www.thegwpf.com/wind-turbines-may-grow-twice-as-tall/

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy -- Other
£42 Million Wasted On Another Renewable Project
By Paul Homewood, Not a Lot of People Know That, Mar 28, 2018
https://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2018/03/28/42-million-wasted-on-another-renewable-project/

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Storage
Wind and solar can become dispatchable within three years
EXCLUSIVE | Hot-rock thermal storage technology will soon enable wind and solar farms to pump out energy 24 hours a day — and at a surprisingly low cost, writes Leigh Collins
By Leigh Collins, Recharge Transition, Mar 21, 2018 [H/t Energy Matters]
The stones stay hot for days or weeks simply by being well insulated; then when energy is required, the heat is converted back into electricity and delivered to the grid for as little as €70 ($86.25) per MWh — far cheaper than any gas peaker plant or battery system.
[SEPP Comment: Strongly doubt the claim!]

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Vehicles
VW storing around 300,000 diesels at 37 facilities around U.S.
By David Shepardson, Reuters, Mar 29, 2018 [H/t Paul Homewood]

Other News that May Be of Interest
Beware the digital tree of knowledge
By Charles G. Battig, American Thinker, Mar 26, 2018

Attribution of 2015-6 Phishing to APT28
By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Mar 24, 2018

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

March of the super intelligent lizards
By Staff Writers, Climate Change Predictions.org, Mar 25, 2018
http://climatetangepredictions.org/uncategorized/1524
“Just when it seemed like we knew all the dangers of climate change, science has to go and throw us this curveball. Warmer temperatures make lizards’ brains develop differently. Last thing we need is some newly super-intelligent lizards judging us.
“That’s the finding of researchers at the University of Sydney in Australia, who tested how rising temperatures affected the intelligence of the tiny lizard species known as the three-lined skinks.”
io9.com, 21 Jan 2012
Vanishing redheads
By Staff Writers, Climate Change Predictions.org, Mar 24, 2018
http://climatechangepredictions.org/uncategorized/1526

“Scientists believe the gene that causes red hair is an evolutionary response to cloudy skies and allows inhabitants to get as much Vitamin D as possible. But if predictions of rising temperatures and blazing sunshine across the British Isles turn out to be correct, flaming red heads could cease to exist within centuries.

“Dr Alistair Moffat, managing director of Galashiels-based ScotlandsDNA, said: ‘We think red hair in Scotland, Ireland and in the North of England is adaption to the climate.’”

The Mirror(UK), 6 Jul 2014

ARTICLES:

1. The EPA Cleans Up Its Science
Now Congress should act to lock in place data transparency.
By Steve Milloy, WSJ, Mar 26, 2018
https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-epa-cleans-up-its-science-1522105331

SUMMARY: In discussing the development of “secret science” by the EPA, the author of “Scare Pollution: Why and How to Fix the EPA” writes:

“The Environmental Protection Agency will no longer rely on ‘secret’ scientific data to justify regulations, Administrator Scott Pruitt announced last week. EPA regulators and agency-funded researchers have become accustomed to producing unaccountable, dodgy science to advance a political agenda.

“The saga began in the early 1990s, when the EPA sought to regulate fine particulate matter known as PM2.5—dust and soot smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter. PM2.5 was not known to cause death, but by 1994 EPA-supported scientists had developed two lines of research purporting to show that it did. When the studies were run past the EPA’s Clean Air Science Advisory Committee, it balked. It believed the studies relied on dubious statistical analysis and asked for the underlying data. The EPA ignored the request.

“As the EPA prepared to issue its proposal for PM2.5 regulation in 1996, Congress stepped in. Rep. Thomas Bliley, chairman of the House Commerce Committee, sent a sharply written letter to Administrator Carol Browner asking for the data underlying studies. Ms. Browner delegated the response to a subordinate, who told Mr. Bliley the EPA saw ‘no useful purpose ‘ in obtaining the data. Congress responded by inserting a provision in a 1998 bill requiring that data used to support federal regulation must be made available to the public via the Freedom of Information Act. But it was hastily written, and a federal appellate court held the law unenforceable in 2003.

“The controversy went dormant until 2011, when a newly Republican Congress took exception to the Obama EPA’s anti-coal rules, which relied on the same PM2.5 studies. Again, the EPA was defiant. Administrator Gina McCarthy refused requests for the data sets and defied a congressional subpoena.
“Bills to resolve the problem died in the Senate. Democrats argued that requiring data for study replication is a threat to intellectual property and an invasion of medical privacy. In fact, the legislation would protect property by requiring a confidentiality agreement, and no personal medical data or information would have been released.”

Mr. Milloy describes how he and his colleagues used California “Death Public Use Files” to determine PM2.5 was not associated with deaths in California.

“The best part is that if you don’t believe the result, you can get the same data for yourself from California and run your own analysis. Then we’ll compare, contrast and debate. That’s how science is supposed to work.

“It would be better if Congress would pass a law requiring data transparency. A future administrator may backslide on the steps Mr. Pruitt is taking. In the meantime, we have science in the sunshine.”

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

2. Attack of the Killer Cappuccino

Californians can look forward to cancer warnings on coffee.
Editorial, WSJ, Mar 30, 2018
https://www.wsj.com/articles/attack-of-the-killer-cappuccino-1522451282

SUMMARY: Underlining the importance of requiring science to be transparent, if it is used for public policy. The burden of proof must be on those who claim harm. the editorial states:

Californians will soon get something besides milk and cinnamon with their coffee—a mandated warning that their morning pick-me-up may kill them. A Los Angeles Superior Court ruled Thursday against Starbucks and other cafes and gas stations, penalizing them because they couldn’t definitively prove that coffee doesn’t cause cancer. In addition to slapping a cancer warning on each cup of joe, the companies may have to pay millions in civil penalties and lawsuit settlements.

At issue is a chemical called acrylamide, which is created when coffee beans are roasted. It’s also common in other foods, including bread, cookies, cereals, potato chips and French fries. But under California’s 1986 Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, better known as Proposition 65, acrylamide is listed as a likely human carcinogen.

California’s cancer list relies heavily on junk science, and with acrylamide the evidence is questionable at best. Some government agencies want more research into its carcinogenic potential, and the American Cancer Society does, too.

But the group also notes that even those tentative concerns derive mainly from studies that examined its effects on lab animals, not people. The doses of acrylamide given to rats and mice “have been as much as 1,000 to 10,000 times higher than the levels people might be exposed to in foods,” the American Cancer Society says. The group adds that for humans ‘there are currently no cancer types for which there is a clearly increased risk related to acrylamide.’

The evidence is so scant that even the World Health Organization’s International Agency for Research on Cancer admitted in 2016 that there was ‘no conclusive evidence for a carcinogenic effect of drinking coffee.’ Its review of more than 1,000 studies turned up evidence that coffee may
reduce the risk of some types of cancer. This is the same alarmist outfit that thinks everything from red meat to working the night shift causes cancer.

But however feeble the evidence, Prop. 65 encourages trial lawyers and their front groups to sue on behalf of the state by offering them a cut of the civil penalties. Last year Prop. 65 cases yielded $25.6 million in settlements, and more than three-fourths of that sum went to the lawyers. Trial lawyer Raphael Metzger brought the case against Starbucks and 90 other cafes and gas stations, working on behalf of something called the Council for Education and Research on Toxics. The same “nonprofit” and attorney also sued McDonald’s and Burger King over acrylamide in 2002.

After discussing possible penalties, the editorial concludes:

The case is further proof that Prop. 65 is a lot like a cup of coffee: Even if it doesn’t kill you, it can keep you up at night. Or maybe it’s further proof that California progressives are nuts.

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