CONFIRMED

EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler

Vows to Continue Pro-Growth Policies

By H. Sterling Burnett

The U.S. Senate confirmed Andrew Wheeler as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on February 28 by a party-line vote of 52 in favor and 47 opposed.

Since becoming acting administrator with the resignation of former Administrator Scott Pruitt, Wheeler has continued President Donald Trump’s efforts to limit and revise regulations the administration says unnecessarily hamper economic growth, energy production and use, and job creation, while maintaining the agency’s focus on environmental protection.

Experienced Hand

Before Wheeler joined the Trump administration’s EPA, he had much experience with the agency. Wheeler twice earned the agency’s Bronze Medal when he worked in EPA’s Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics in the
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Facts and Data Prevail at House Hearing on Oceans and Climate Change

By Aaron Stover

The U.S. House of Representatives’ Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing on ocean health and climate change, moderated by Subcommittee Chair Jared Huffman (D-CA) and Ranking Member Tom McClintock (R-CA).

Among the witnesses called by the majority were Carol Browner, administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency during the Clinton administration, and Beth Casoni, executive director of the Massachusetts Lobstermen’s Association.
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FERC Streamlines LNG Export Process, Approves New Louisiana Terminal

By Bonner R. Cohen

In greenlighting a liquefied natural gas (LNG) export terminal for the first time in two years, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) established new criteria for assessing the facilities’ greenhouse gas emissions.

In approving Venture Global’s Calcasieu Pass LNG export project in Cameron Parish, Louisiana and the associated TransCameron natural gas pipeline to feed it, FERC applied a new approach which considers direct greenhouse gas emissions from LNG facilities under the National Environmental Policy Act but not an assessment of broader upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions.

The decision on how to calculate greenhouse gas emissions was a compromise FERC Chairman Neil Chatterjee agreed to, to satisfy a demand by Cheryl LaFleur, one of the commission’s two Democrats, that a greenhouse gas calculation be included in the final order issued on February 21.

Unlike previous FERC orders for LNG facilities, the one for Calcasieu Pass includes estimates of the project’s direct greenhouse gas emissions.

Template for Future Approvals

In addition to establishing a standard for calculating greenhouse gas emissions from an LNG plant’s operations, FERC also signed an agreement with the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for coordinated LNG terminal reviews and took other steps to streamline the approval process for LNG terminals.

Chatterjee indicated FERC’s efforts to improve the LNG approval process over the past year put the agency in a position to consider 12 other pending LNG projects efficiently.

“This is significant, as I anticipate we’ll be able to use the framework developed in this order to evaluate the other LNG certificates that the commission is considering,” Chatterjee said in a statement.

Energizing the World

Fossil fuel exports benefit the world, says Jay Lehr, a member of the International Climate Science Coalition’s Science Advisory Board.

“The only good thing the Obama administration did to boost American energy, together with Congress, was to lift the ban on petroleum exports,” Lehr said. “This allowed us to become a new, reliable source of energy to the world.

“With this project, FERC is now stepping up the flow of LNG to countries eager to have it,” said Lehr.

Says State Should Follow

The Calcasieu facility is designed to have the capacity to process 10 million metric tons of LNG per year, with a peak capacity to export 12 million tons of LNG annually under optimal conditions.

Louisiana should follow FERC’s regulatory lead to expedite further LNG and pipeline operations in the state, says Daniel Erspamer, CEO of the Pelican Institute for Public Policy.

“We are pleased the federal government approved this important project, which will generate jobs and pathways for opportunities for working families and job seekers in Louisiana,” said Erspamer. “We hope Louisiana’s state government will see this as an opportunity to adopt friendlier, more predictable, and inviting policies to bring jobs and investments to our state.

“Our current system is driving jobs to Florida, Tennessee, and Texas, which have better policies across the board,” Erspamer said. “Louisiana’s working families deserve a fairer and more predictable regulatory environment.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research and a senior policy analyst with the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow.
Minority members invited testimony from David Legates, Ph.D., of the University of Delaware, and Kevin Dayaratna, Ph.D., senior statistician with The Heritage Foundation. The latter two witnesses are both policy advisors to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

**Hurricane Link Debated**

The majority party’s witnesses told the committee climate change is causing a variety of problems, such as more powerful hurricanes, water-temperature change, and coastal erosion.

In his opening statement at the February 7 hearing, ranking member McClintock noted “hurricane activity is much lower [now] than that recorded in the eighteenth century.”

Browner conceded human-induced climate changes are not creating more hurricanes, instead arguing climate change is making hurricanes stronger.

Legates cited in his testimony the Fifth Assessment Report of the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to refute Browner’s claims.

“There is low confidence in long-term ... changes in tropical cyclone activity, ... and there is low confidence in attribution of changes in tropical cyclone activity to human influence owing to ... lack of physical understanding of the links between anthropogenic drivers of climate and tropical cyclone activity, and the low level of agreement between studies as to the relative importance of internal variability, and anthropogenic and natural forcings,” Legates quoted the IPCC’s most recent assessment as stating.

Legates went on to say the frequency and severity of landfall hurricanes in the continental United States has remained unchanged since 1990.

**Claims of Rising Sea Levels**

Legates testified claims climate change is causing sea levels to rise at an unusually rapid rate are not true, and some of the purported effects of rising seas are caused by other factors.

“Global sea levels have risen naturally at a rate of about seven to eight inches per century for at least several hundred years,” Legates testified.

“Locally, this rate may be higher due to local land subsidence and/or compaction of sediments, or lower due to isostatic rebound.”

“[I]ncreasing [carbon dioxide] concentrations are not significantly affecting the rate of sea level rise,” Legates testified. “As these concentrations have increased from before the industrial age when atmospheric [carbon dioxide] levels were about 280 ppm [parts per million] to current conditions where they exceed 400 ppm, the lack of a significant change in the rate of increase implies that sea level rise is not responding to changes in greenhouse gas concentrations.”

**Lobster Controversy**

Casoni testified about numerous threats to sea life in general and lobster fisheries in particular, including the potential threat from offshore oil spills, should new oil production in the Atlantic Ocean be allowed, and plastic waste in the ocean. Among the threats she cited to New England’s fisheries, two were directly related to climate change or proposed responses to it: warming oceans and offshore wind turbines.

“Warming water trends are causing lobster stocks to shift,” said Casoni. “The Gulf of Maine, for example, is one of the fastest warming bodies of water on the planet. In the last century, it has warmed faster than 99 percent of the oceans. It has been estimated that by 2050 ... warming could cut lobster populations by 62 percent in the Gulf of Maine.”

Evidence shows Casoni’s fears about the impact of rising ocean temperatures on lobsters are misplaced, says James Taylor, a senior fellow with The Heartland Institute.

“Lobstermen in Maine are hauling in approximately eight times more lobsters now than they did when the Earth began to resume warming about 40 years ago,” Taylor said.

**Wind Farm Dangers**

Casoni also testified she feared building large offshore wind farms to reduce fossil fuel consumption to fight climate change could disrupt coastal fisheries.

“There is increasing concern about the impact on the future of fishing in offshore wind farms, and many fishermen are concerned about navigating around the turbines,” said Casoni. “Depending on turbine placements, fishermen may not be able to set their gear as they typically do.

“We are also engaged in the difficult challenge of right whale conservation, but this issue will only become more complicated as offshore wind farms spring up in the feeding grounds of right whales,” Casoni testified, referring to a species also known as black whales.

**Economic Pain, No Climate Gain**

Proposed restrictions on fossil fuels to prevent climate change will impose huge economic costs and provide no appreciable benefit in terms of preventing climate change, Dayaratna testified.

“Policies aimed at ‘decarbonizing’ the American economy are predicated on faulty models that are prone to user-selected manipulation. These policies will raise the cost of energy, thus resulting in devastating economic impacts. On the other hand, policies that are aimed at taking advantage of fossil-based fuels have tremendous potential to grow the economy.”

KEVIN DAYARATNA, PH.D.
SENIOR STATISTICIAN
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION

**INTERNET INFO**


Texas Breaks Crude Oil Production Record in 2018

By Kenneth Artz

Texas produced 1.54 billion barrels of crude oil in 2018, breaking the previous record of 1.28 billion barrels set in 1973, a new report states.

The study notes natural gas production grew as well, reaching 8.8 trillion cubic feet in 2018.

‘Firing on All Cylinders’
The report by the Texas Independent Producers Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO) shows Texas is leading the United States to energy independence, said Texas Gov. Greg Abbott in a statement made upon the report’s release.

“As the national leader in oil and natural gas production, Texas is paving the way for America’s energy independence,” said Abbott. “From technological advancements resulting in increased oil and natural gas output to our LNG export facilities, the Lone Star State’s energy economy is firing on all cylinders.

“As governor, I will continue to work with our independent oil and gas producers to take our economy to even greater heights,” Abbott said.

The February 2019 report states crude oil production reached 1.26 billion barrels in 2017, almost breaking the 1973 record, according to figures from the Railroad Commission of Texas.

The record-breaking 2018 production occurred despite a 40 percent decline in oil prices during the fourth quarter.

Job Numbers Up
Nationwide, employment in the oil and natural gas industry also grew in 2018.

The U.S. oil and gas industry directly employed 880,681 people at the end of 2018, a 5 percent increase over the 2017 employment figures, TIPRO reports. Texas’ share of those employment numbers total more than 352,000 jobs, or around 40 percent.

Texas added 27,000 new oil and natural gas jobs in 2018, the largest gain for any single state that year, followed by Oklahoma with 5,266, New Mexico with 3,626, North Dakota with 2,808, and Colorado with 2,282 new oil and gas industry jobs in 2018.

‘153 Years of Progress’
The oil and gas boom in Texas is a triumph of the imagination and innovation, says Rob Bradley Jr., founder and CEO of the Institute for Energy Research.

“Texas’s resurgence as a world-leading oil producer reflects human ingenuity in a free-market environment,” said Bradley. “The state’s new record is happy testament to Julian Simon’s view that minerals really come from the mind, not the ground, and incentivized resource development is expansive, not depletive.

“Texas’s record-setting numbers at the wellhead also reflect a boom in transportation, refining, petrochemicals, and, with natural gas, liquefaction for export,” Bradley said. “Thank President Trump and state leaders for wholly rejecting the ‘keep-it-in-the-ground’ philosophy of other states such as New York and California.”

Bradley says what’s happening in Texas is not an overnight success.

“Think of it as 153 years of progress,” said Bradley. “Texas’s first oil well was drilled in 1866. The first major discovery was in 1894. Spindletop blew in 1901 to make the state the new oil center of the United States.

“Steady increases during the next decades peaked in the 1970s, when federal price controls were imposed and when the scientific consensus was the future of oil and gas was from coal synfuels,” Bradley said. “Yet here we are today, with Texas’s output last year exceeding 1.5 billion barrels and with robust growth expected to continue into the future.”

Credits Market Forces
Texas has led the United States in oil and gas production almost from the very beginning of oil’s discovery as a useful commodity, says Gary Stone, executive vice president of engineer-

ing for Five States Energy and a policy advisor to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

“Spindletop, Burk Burnett, Daisy Bradford, and Santa Rita opened new regions to the industry that were the backbone of American growth in the twentieth century,” Stone said. “Now, new technology applied to mature producing regions has created another boom, with production topping record levels.

“With 40 percent of industry jobs and a huge margin of the newly created jobs, Texas again leads the country,” said Stone. “None of this would be possible without the free-market forces unleashed by the Trump administration, following the oppressive industry regulation of the previous eight years. It’s a triumph of capitalism, in stark contrast to the collapse of the once-powerful Venezuelan oil industry under socialism.”

Kenneth Artz (kennethcharlesartz@gmx.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Ballooning Costs, Missed Deadlines Derail California High-Speed Rail Project

By Kenneth Artz

California Gov. Gavin Newsom announced he is pulling the plug on the state’s massive high-speed rail project after it incurred enormous cost overruns that pushed the potential price tag to more than $77 billion and put the project more than a decade behind schedule.

Doomed by Cost Overruns

The controversial project championed by Newsom’s predecessor, Jerry Brown, was intended to link Los Angeles to San Francisco. Voters approved a ballot measure in 2008 to finance and build the approximately 520-mile rail line. At the time, it was estimated the project would cost $33 billion and be completed by 2020. Officials said they hoped to eventually connect the line to San Diego and Sacramento.

Construction fell years behind schedule. A recent audit of the project conducted by the California State Auditor's office concluded the repeated cost overruns and missed deadlines had inflated the eventual cost to more than $77 billion and the project would not be completed until 2033.

Addressing these setbacks in his first State of the State address on February 12, Newsom said, “Let’s be real. The current project, as planned, would cost too much and respectfully take too long. There’s been too little oversight and not enough transparency.”

Instead of abandoning the project entirely, Newsom said the state will continue construction of a 163-mile segment connecting Merced to Bakersfield in the state’s Central Valley.

‘Bullet-Train to Nowhere’

The project was a government boondoggle from the start, says Baruch Feigenbaum, assistant director of transportation policy for the Reason Foundation.

“California’s high-speed bullet train has been aptly derided as ‘the bullet-train to nowhere,’” said Feigenbaum. “Most of the people in that region would be driving anyway, since the Central Valley is relatively low-income and the people who generally use high-speed rail are wealthy business travelers.

“I think just about everybody is a winner if this project is canceled, because it will not do what it says it will do for the price expected,” said Feigenbaum. “If it goes forward, every California taxpayer will be a loser because the project does not serve any worthwhile purpose.”

Sees Better Options

Newsom should scuttle the entire project because the segment he wants to complete will serve relatively few people at high costs, says Feigenbaum.

“There are those who still want the train in the Central Valley, the part of the line Newsom is continuing, but I think they see it more as a symbol rather than an actual worthwhile transportation project, since very few people are going to be taking this train,” Feigenbaum said. “Most of the people in that region would be driving anyway, since the Central Valley is relatively low-income and the people who generally use high-speed rail are wealthy business travelers.

“People of California have realized the train doesn’t measure up because they were promised a direct line to nowhere,” said Feigenbaum.

“The people of California have realized the train doesn’t measure up because the costs are extremely high, even as far as these sorts of projects go.

“They are grossly frustrated with it because they were promised a direct line between San Francisco and Los Angeles for about $30 billion and they are now being asked to settle for this ridiculous boondoggle in the Central Valley which could cost close to $100 billion or more,” Feigenbaum said. “Most people now are waking up to the fact this was a bad transportation project from the start.”

Calls for Cancellation

Officials said the state will continue construction of a 163-mile segment connecting Merced to Bakersfield in the state’s Central Valley.

By comparison.

In a driverless car, travelers could get on Highway 405 and just sit back while drivers might be in our future.

“California has been aptly derided as ‘the bullet-train to nowhere.’ The people of California have realized the train doesn’t measure up because the costs are extremely high, even as far as these sorts of projects go.”

BARUCH FEIGENBAUM
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION POLICY
REASON FOUNDATION

Official Connections:
California Gov. Gavin Newsom

Emulating Europe?

The appeal of trains for Californians is a matter of wanting to be more like Europe, says Jackson.

“I think there are a whole lot of Americans, in California and beyond—especially among Democrats, people from the left side of the political spectrum, and politicians on the East and West Coasts—who want to be more like Europe,” said Jackson.

“Former Gov. Brown is the biggest loser on this project,” Jackson said. “Its failure will be part of his legacy, but Gov. Newsom and others could still salvage their reputations and gain something from this if they just cut their losses, move on, and learn a lesson from it.”

Kenneth Artz (kennethcharlesartz@gmx.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Fossil Fuels Are Good for U.S. National Security, Study Reports

By Linnea Lueken


The use of fossil fuels benefits the United States and its national security, states the report, published by The Heartland Institute, which also publishes Environment & Climate News. On the other hand, laws and regulations proposed to fight climate change, such as federal and state restrictions on carbon dioxide emissions, carbon dioxide taxes, and subsidies for select renewable energy technologies, endanger national security, the report states.

Benefits from Warming Found
Large increases in crop yields, which have provided the United States with unparalleled food security, are a result of modest warming since the late nineteenth century, the study finds.

The United States has more combined coal, natural gas, and oil resources than any other nation in the world, the report notes. This energy dominance provides the nation with economic advantages, increased international leverage, a greater ability to help our allies economically and militarily, and expanded military power.

The study notes energy costs largely determine economic performance, including the development of technological innovations, all of which enhance military and diplomatic power. Because every proposal to fight climate change would increase energy costs and reduce its reliability, implementing these policies would make the United States more vulnerable economically, geopolitically, and militarily, especially to global competitors such as China and Russia, the study reports.

Says Warming Reduces Threats
Global warming alarmists are wrong to claim climate change increases global tensions through bad weather and drought, says James Taylor, a senior fellow with The Heartland Institute and author of the report.

“Alarmists frequently assert global warming is a threat multiplier because it will cause crop failures, droughts, and extreme weather events that exacerbate political and military tensions,” said Taylor. “However, the science clearly shows as our planet has warmed, crop yields regularly set records nearly every year, and there has been no increase in droughts, or hurricanes, or any other extreme weather or climate events.

“‘To the extent global warming is impacting threat multipliers, it is reducing geopolitical and economic threats,’ Taylor said.

Cure Worse Than Disease?
Climate regulations restricting fossil fuel use or raising energy prices undermine the U.S. economy and national security, says Taylor.

“A strong economy is absolutely necessary to fund and support a powerful military,” said Taylor. “By imposing expensive, economy-killing energy sources on America, global warming alarmists would severely undercut national security.

“Economic prosperity is important to sustaining a military able to combat threats to Americans,” Taylor said.

To enhance national security, Taylor writes, policymakers should (1) encourage greater production of U.S. domestic conventional energy resources, (2) encourage optimal use of domestic conventional energy resources in the American economy, (3) support more U.S. conventional energy exports, and (4) resist calls to impose carbon dioxide restrictions on the economy.

Linnea Lueken (linnea.heartland@gmail.com) writes from South Carolina.
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**NM Considers Big Increase in Costly Renewable Energy Mandate**

**By Kenneth Artz**

Legislation introduced in the New Mexico Legislature would increase the state’s renewable energy mandate (REM) and provide a consumer-paid financing mechanism for a forced transition to wind and solar power.

Senate Bill (S.B.) 275 would increase the amount of electricity utilities are required to provide from “renewable” sources, from the 20 percent by 2020 currently required by the state’s REM to 50 percent by 2030 and 80 percent by 2045.

S.B. 489 would help finance the transition from fossil fuel powered electric plants to renewables through the establishment of “energy transition bonds” to be paid off by a “non-bypassable charge paid by all customers of a qualifying utility for the recovery of energy transition costs,” the bill states.

**Documented Cost Increases**

States with REMs have had their energy costs rise twice as rapidly as the national average, with electricity prices being 26 percent higher on average in states with REMs than in those without them, states a paper by Timothy Benson, a policy analyst for The Heartland Institute, that publishes *Environment and Climate News*. The higher the REM, the greater the increase in electricity prices.

Benson’s paper cites a study by the Brookings Institution which found replacing conventional power with wind power raises electricity prices by 50 percent and replacing conventional power with solar power triples electricity costs.

Benson found New Mexico’s existing REM cost state taxpayers and ratepayers more than $192 million in 2016, raising electricity prices by 6.18 percent. Additional REM-related costs included a loss of more than $405 million in economic activity and more than 3,000 jobs in the state.

This research indicates New Mexico’s current REM will increase electric power prices in the state by an additional $206 million by 2020, with electricity prices increasing by a further 6.77 percent, resulting in an additional 3,500 jobs lost and $444 million in additional foregone economic activity. Those costs would be expected to rise substantially if New Mexico were to increase its REM requirement, as proposed in S.B. 275.

**Says Repeal, Don’t Expand**

Expanding the REM would not improve the environment, but it would harm New Mexico’s working families, says Benson.

“Affordable energy is the key to productivity growth and the production of virtually all goods and services economy-wide,” said Benson. “Increasing New Mexico’s REM would have no tangible impact on global carbon dioxide emissions while making everything more expensive for working families in New Mexico and raising costs for businesses. Instead of seeking to expand New Mexico’s renewable energy mandate, the state’s legislators should be looking to repeal it,” Benson said.

**Rough on Ratepayers**

Increasing New Mexico’s reliance on renewables is going to hit New Mexico electricity consumers hard, says Paul Gessing, president of the Rio Grande Foundation, citing data from Arizona State University’s business school which estimated New Mexico’s electricity rates would more than double if the state adopted a 50 by 30 plan as proposed in S.B. 275.

“New Mexico is already on its way to 20 percent RPS by 2020, and research from the University of Wyoming’s Timothy Considine indicates increasing the state’s REM would cost ratepayers $2.3 billion more than if the state did nothing,” said Gessing. “This current proposal is way more complicated than proposals Considine looked at, with the possibility the legislature could push the REM to 100 percent by 2050.

“We at the Rio Grande Foundation are generally agnostic concerning how utilities generate their power, and we’ve been arguing for a price cap to say, ‘Hey, if this wind and solar is really cheaper like they keep claiming, then maybe they should be willing to accept a reasonable cap on prices, say like about the level we are paying today, rather than forcing ratepayers to accept ever-rising rate increases over time to pay for electricity from higher-cost sources,’” Gessing said.

**Price Hikes, Job Losses**

Gessing says the two Senate proposals would cost New Mexico jobs for no environmental gain.

“These two bills will rake New Mexico’s taxpayers over the coals with a massive increase in electricity costs for, at best case, minimal gains in the environment that could be achieved at lower costs and possibly better outcomes through other technology,” Gessing said. “Obviously, New Mexico is a very small component of the United States’ carbon emissions, and when you factor in China and other global carbon emitters, New Mexico’s share really becomes a vanishingly small portion of overall global emissions.

“On the jobs front, New Mexico is Navajo country, and there’s a lot of poverty on the Navajo reservation,” said Gessing. “A lot of people—Anglo, Navajo, etc.—work at the coal mines and at coal-fired power plants, and despite there often not being high levels of educational attainment in the region, workers are making good money because power plant and mining jobs pay well; yet these jobs are going to go away if these Senate bills become law, necessitating the end of coal-powered energy in the state.”

Kenneth Artz (kennethcharlesartz@gmx.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
U.S. District Court Dismisses Kids’ Lawsuit Against Trump Climate Policies

By Bonner R. Cohen

A federal district judge in Philadelphia dismissed a lawsuit by two Pennsylvania boys and an environmental group challenging the Trump administration’s rollback of some Obama-era climate regulations.

In Clean Air Council v. United States, Judge Paul Diamond of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania ruled the plaintiffs lacked standing to sue the Trump administration because the U.S. Constitution does not guarantee due process rights to what the boys and the Philadelphia-based Clean Air Council (CAC) called a “life-sustaining climate.” Diamond noted the boys, who were ages seven and 11 when the lawsuit was filed in November 2017, could not trace their respective health problems to the Trump administration’s climate policies.

Diamond granted requests by President Donald Trump, Energy Secretary Rick Perry, and other administration officials to dismiss the case.

‘Best Left to the Political Process’
The judiciary is not the branch of government charged with making climate policy, Diamond ruled.

“Plaintiffs’ disagreement with the defendants is a policy debate best left to the political process,” Diamond wrote. “Because I have neither the authority nor the inclination to assume control of the Executive Branch, I will grant defendants’ motion.”

Diamond rejected what he characterized as the plaintiffs’ argument he “supervise any action that the President and his appointees take that might touch on ‘the environment.’”

Criticized Oregon Ruling
In his decision dismissing the CAC lawsuit, Diamond took the rare step of rebuking a decision made by one of his peers, Judge Ann Aiken of the U.S. District Court of Oregon in the case Juliana v. United States.

In Juliana, 21 children represented by an environmental activist organization sued the federal government over its climate change policies. Aiken ordered the lawsuit to trial in 2016, stating “the right to a climate system capable of sustaining human life is fundamental to a free and ordered society.” Aiken’s determination the young plaintiffs had a constitutional right to a livable climate was the first such ruling by a U.S. judge.

Aiken’s ruling is at odds with previous court decisions, Diamond stated in his decision.

“[T]he Juliana Court certainly contravened or ignored longstanding precedent,” and the government power granted through guarantees of a stable climate would be “apparently without limit,” Diamond wrote.

“Plaintiffs seek to create an entirely new doctrine—investing the Federal Government with an affirmative duty to protect all land and resources within the United States,” Diamond wrote. “The Julianna Court alone has recognized this new doctrine. … [T]he Court’s reasoning is less than persuasive.”

‘Noble Lie on Steroids’
Diamond was right to disparage Aiken’s ruling, says Christopher Horner, an attorney and senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

“The federal court in Pennsylvania threw the suit out and in the process was fairly direct in criticizing the Oregon judge’s activism in supporting the demand for a climate plan without apparent limit,” which is the most alarming aspect of the decision,” Horner said. “Aiken’s ruling offers the ruling class a bottomless well of authority to usurp liberty and impose suffering in the name of something it actually would not affect. It is the Noble Lie on steroids, possibly the most Noble Lie ever perpetrated.

“Even if you accept arguendo alarmists’ model assumptions, the United States disappearing would make no difference, with our sacrifice swamped by greenhouse gas increases from the developing world,” said Horner. ‘Taking into account the fact climate alarmists’ disaster scenarios have repeatedly proven wrong, the Oregon court’s ruling is just a political prescription having nothing to do with climate. Climate becomes a not-very-good excuse to abandon our democratic processes and the separation of powers.’

‘Trying to Rewrite the Constitution’
Diamond’s decision to criticize Aiken’s previous ruling was made in defense of the law and the U.S. Constitution, says David Wojick, Ph.D., a policy analyst with the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT).

“Judge Diamond’s strong decision is most welcome, especially since these outrageous climate lawsuits are trying to rewrite the Constitution,” said Wojick. “Under the law, he didn’t have to say anything after standing was denied, because the case was then out of his court, but his ruling went further, adding a substantive, constitutional, reason for rejecting this and any similar climate lawsuit.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research and a senior policy analyst with CFAC.T.
Scientists Test Use of Genetically Modified Mosquitoes to Fight Malaria

By Sarah Lott

Medical entomologists have taken a significant step forward in combating the spread of malaria, the highly lethal mosquito-transmitted infectious disease.

Researchers in Terni, Italy used CRISPR technology to modify reproduction-related (gene drive) genes in female Anopheles gambiae mosquitoes to render them infertile. The gene drive modification also alters the female mosquitoes’ mouth anatomy to more closely resemble a male mosquito proboscis, making them unable to pierce skin.

If the alteration proves successful, eventually almost all of the genetically modified mosquito offspring will inherit the trait. If introduced into nature, this could cause targeted mosquito populations to self-destruct.

Mosquito Population Destruction

When a group of genetically modified mosquitoes was introduced into a population of unmodified mosquitoes in a small, closed laboratory at Imperial College London, the mosquito population collapsed.

Building on that success, scientists are conducting a much larger controlled experiment to observe the impact of the modified mosquitoes in an environment more closely resembling their native ecosystems.

The research team recently released the gene drive mosquitoes into a secure environment in its laboratory in Terni, Italy. Sealed behind tightly locked glass doors, a chamber in the Terni lab contains enclosures where conditions were carefully designed to mimic elements of the natural African habitat where malaria-carrying mosquitoes thrive.

The scientists have released immature genetically modified mosquitoes in four of the six cages. In two cages the researchers introduced gene drive mosquitoes in amounts equaling 25 percent of the unmodified populations. Two cages received gene-altered mosquitoes in amounts equal to 50 percent of the existing population, and the remaining two cages will be used as a control group for comparison, receiving no modified mosquitoes.

The researchers hope the mosquito populations will collapse or at least significantly decline in the next year in the four cages in which gene drive mosquitoes were introduced.

If this experiment proves successful, the scientists would like to introduce the genetically modified mosquitoes in malaria-devastated areas of Africa to greatly reduce or eliminate the mosquito population.

Government Intrusion Concerns

An open letter from Target Malaria, an international nonprofit research team working with the Terni team on the mosquito project, says governments should not prevent gene drive research or prohibit the controlled introduction of gene drive mosquitoes into the environment.

“Malaria cases are on the rise again after decades of progress,” said Target Malaria’s letter, which was delivered to the participants at the 14th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) in 2018. “Gene drive is a well-established field of research [with] recent advances in gene editing tools having allowed notable progress in the two years since gene drive was first discussed at CBD.

“Scientists, alongside regulatory experts, funders, and sponsors of the research, are working together to ensure research is carried out safely and responsibly, by building on previous experiences, … and putting in place monitoring and containment systems to prevent accidental releases,” Target Malaria wrote. “Ongoing discussions are also taking place to determine suitable conditions for field evaluations.”

Seeking Permission

Target Malaria’s letter asks the member states party to the CBD not to restrict gene drive research unnecessarily.

“Closing the door to research by creating arbitrary barriers, high uncertainty, and open-ended delays will significantly limit our ability to provide answers to the questions policymakers, regulators, and the public are asking,” the letter states. “Key institutions, such as the African Union, have called for continued work in this field, emphasizing the value of the opportunity and the need for informed case-by-case assessment of this technology by national authorities.”

‘Monumental’ Potential

The potential of gene drive modifications to benefit humanity by reducing malaria cases cannot be overstated, says Dr. Henry Miller, a senior fellow at the Pacific Research Institute.

“Malaria is one of the worst of the infectious disease scourges existing today,” Miller said. “In 2016, more than 200 million cases of malaria occurred worldwide and about 445,000 people died, mostly children in sub-Saharan Africa.

“Eradication of the mosquitoes that transmit the disease would be a monumental humanitarian and public health breakthrough,” Miller said. “The meticulous, careful, step-by-step approach taken by the international team that has created and is testing mosquitoes that contain a gene drive and are intended to reduce the target mosquito population is precisely the correct, responsible approach.”

Sarah Lott (lottsarah@gmail.com) writes from Rowlett, Texas.
Hawaii Swamped by Carbon Dioxide Tax Bills

By Timothy Benson

Multiple carbon dioxide tax bills are under consideration in the current session of the Hawaii State Legislature.

The purpose of a so-called carbon tax is to decrease carbon dioxide emissions by levying a tax based on the amount of emissions produced.

**Multiple Proposals, All Expensive**

Hawaiians already pay more for electricity than residents of any other state, at 26.05 cents per kilowatt hour, the U.S. Energy Information Administration reports. Hawaii’s retail electric rates are 148 percent higher than the national average.

House Bill 1579 would establish a flat $15-per-ton tax on carbon dioxide emissions from the use of fossil fuels, starting in 2020.

H.B. 1287 would impose on fossil fuel distributors a $20-per-ton tax on carbon dioxide emissions beginning in 2020, increasing by $5 per ton until 2034, when it would be capped at $55 per ton.

Neither H.B. 1579 nor H.B. 1287 made it out of committee.

A third bill, S.B. 1463, has already passed the Senate and was still active in the House at press time.

**New Range of Taxes**

Senate Bill 143 would replace Hawaii’s $1.05 per barrel “environmental response, energy, and food security tax” on petroleum products other than jet fuel and any fuel sold to a refiner, with a range of taxes on every type of fossil fuel used in Hawaii.

The bill would impose a tax of 3.6 cents per gallon on propane; 4.2 cents per gallon on butane; 6.35 cents per gallon on home heating and diesel fuels; $13.13 per ton on coal; 33.2 cents per thousand cubic feet on natural gas; 5.56 cents per gallon on gasoline; 5.98 cents per gallon on jet fuel; 7.47 cents per gallon on oil used to make and seal asphalt and roads; 6.7 cents per gallon on lubricants; 7.01 cents per gallon on petrochemical feedstocks; and $16.35 per ton of municipal solid waste, with a variety of other fuels not specifically listed being taxed at $6.25 per ton of carbon dioxide emissions.

S.B. 1463 would make Hawaii the first state in the country to pass a carbon dioxide tax.

‘Bait-and-Switch’

The carbon dioxide tax proposals are less about reducing emissions than raising revenue and directing residents’ energy choices, says Kelli Akina, Ph.D., president of the Grassroot Institute of Hawaii.

“The outward intent of S.B. 1463 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by putting a ‘price on carbon,’ but that’s only part of the story,” said Akina. “The real effect would be to replace the state’s already high fuel tax with a complex tax scheme that lacks transparency and would cost Hawaii residents dearly.

“If passed into law, this bill would let legislators pat themselves on the back for their environmental stewardship at the same time as they hike electric bills and increase the cost of living,” Akina said. “It is nothing more than a bait-and-switch, something designed to supposedly be ‘revenue neutral’ for the government but which would be economically damaging to the average Hawaiian resident.”

**Hitting the Poor the Hardest**

Testifying before a joint hearing of the Hawaii Senate Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary, Scott Seu, senior vice president of public affairs for the Hawaiian Electric Company, the state’s largest electricity supplier, said S.B. 1463 would raise customers’ electricity costs by $19 million a year.

“Any consideration of a carbon tax needs to be done thoughtfully and with full view into how such a tax would achieve desired results without unintended negative consequences, especially with respect to low to moderate income customers,” Seu testified. “These are the people who are least likely to have solar systems on their roofs or electric vehicles in their garages, meaning they would be hit the hardest with a carbon [dioxide] tax.”

**Higher Cost of Living**

In his testimony before the joint Senate committee hearing, Thomas Yamachika, president of the Tax Foundation of Hawaii, expressed doubt that low-income Hawaiians will be able to cover their basic expenses if S.B. 1463 becomes law.

“Will their paychecks be enough to pay the rent, keep the lights on, or feed the family?” asked Yamachika. “If the cost of simply driving to work from the suburbs is horrible now, just wait until the tax kicks in.

“And if you think the hammer of a carbon tax will fall most heavily on huge, faceless corporations like the electric company, the airlines, or the shippers, think again [because] businesses can and will pass on any enhanced costs to their consumers if they hope to continue providing their products or services,” Yamachika said. “That means our already astronomical cost of living could head further up into the stratosphere.”

S.B. 1463 would raise energy costs by forcing residents and businesses to purchase electricity from renewable energy sources, says George Jamerson, director of government relations at The Heartland Institute.

“The will have negative consequences for residential energy consumers and energy-intensive industries alike. And as with all regressive taxes, low-income communities will be disproportionately affected.”

Timothy Benson (tbenson@heartland.org) is a policy analyst with The Heartland Institute.
Oregon Teens’ State Climate Lawsuit Dismissed

By Duggan Flanakin

A three-judge panel of the Oregon State Court of Appeals dismissed a lawsuit against then-Gov. John Kitzhaber filed in 2011 on behalf of two teenage girls asserting climate change is harming the state’s natural resources and that the state government had an obligation to protect them.

The Court of Appeals ruled the state has no duty to protect natural resources from climate change, among other potential threats, as part of a public trust.

Public Trust Claim

In 2011, teenage plaintiffs Kelsey Cascadia, Rose Juliana, and Olivia Chernaik sued Kitzhaber in Lane County Circuit Court, claiming Oregon had a legal duty to protect “vital natural resources,” such as land, water, and the atmosphere, which they argued the state holds in public trust. As with other public trust obligations, the government has a fiduciary duty to protect those resources for the use of current and future generations, they argued.

The plaintiffs asserted Oregon’s fiduciary obligation extends to protecting natural resources for “conservation, pollution abatement, maintenance and enhancement of aquatic and fish life, habitat for fish and wildlife, ecological values, in-stream flows, commerce, navigation, fishing, recreation, energy production, and the transport of natural resources.”

Lane County Presiding Judge Karsten Rasmussen rejected the youths’ arguments, granting the state’s motion for summary dismissal and ruling only “submerged and submersible lands”—the land between the high and low water marks—is part of the public trust. The state’s only obligation otherwise is to retain ownership of public lands.

The teens appealed Rasmussen’s decision to a state district court, which affirmed the lower court’s decision.

No State Climate Obligations

With the three-judge panel’s decision, Oregon’s appellate court affirmed the state has no legally enforceable obligation to protect natural resources from climate change.

“We conclude that the public trust doctrine does not impose a fiduciary obligation on the state to take affirmative action to protect public trust resources from the effects of climate change,” wrote Judge Rex Armstrong on behalf of the panel. “The Oregon public-trust doctrine is rooted in the idea that the state is restrained from disposing or allowing uses of public-trust resources that substantially impair the recognized public use of those resources.

“We can find no source under the Oregon conception of the public-trust doctrine for imposing fiduciary duties on the state to affirmatively act to protect public-trust resources from the effects of climate change,” Armstrong ruled.

Plaintiffs’ attorney Courtney Johnson said the court missed an opportunity to clarify exactly what is included in the public trust, especially in light of the “urgency in the climate issue.”

Same Youth, Separate Case

Co-plaintiff Juliana is also the lead plaintiff in a similar case pending before the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

In Juliana, et al. v. United States of America, et al., the environmental group Our Children’s Trust filed a lawsuit against the federal government, including former President Barack Obama and current President Donald Trump, on behalf of Juliana and 20 other teens, claiming the federal government is violating their constitutional rights to a healthy, livable environment through policies subsidizing and promoting the use of fossil fuels.

Juliana’s plaintiffs argue the federal government knowingly approved policies that, based on its own science, threatened the habitability of the planet.

Emotional Appeals

The plaintiffs in these youths’ climate cases are being used by anti-fossil-fuel activists as political pawns, relying on emotion, not evidence, in the hopes of forcing government action, says Paul Driessen, a senior policy analyst for the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow and a policy advisor to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

“Not one of these plaintiffs has presented any credible evidence the relatively tiny increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide since 1850 have driven any climate change or unprecedented weather,” Driessen said. “Instead, they design their computer models and recalculate real-world data to try to fit the facts to conform to their own theories.

“Children today are being indoctrinated—through slogans, images of drowning polar bears and dying colonies of honeybees, and fear-mongering about sea-level rise and other imagined terrors—to believe ‘denying’ the official line on climate change is tantamount to treason,” said Driessen.

“Preventing climate change is not their real goal,” Driessen said. “Rather, they want to completely transform the U.S. energy sector of the economy on the basis of headlines, hype, hysteria, and computer models, when what we really need is a nationwide, robust debate on the importance of the scientific evidence regarding ongoing changes in the Earth’s climate.”

‘Unfettered Government Control’

Requiring the government to develop plans to fight climate change based on the theory that humans can control the climate is an invitation to virtually limitless rule by judges, says Christopher C. Horner, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

“The demand for a court-ordered regulatory plan in the name of fighting climate change, in the face of those plans’ failure in Congress and through [the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency], is an invitation to unfettered government control over peoples’ lives,” said Horner. “Climate alarmists’ scenarios have been proven wrong repeatedly, and allowing the plaintiffs to prevail would open up our entire society to judicially imposed controls over peoples’ lives and liberty that have been rejected in Congress, all in the vain effort to control the world’s climate.”

“These radical activists are using the courts to abandon our constitutional republican form of government, principally its separation of powers,” Horner said.

Duggan Flanakin (dflanakin@gmail.com) writes from Austin, Texas.
Federal Court Rejects Challenge to Mountain Valley Pipeline Approval

By Bonner R. Cohen

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit dismissed all 16 challenges environmental activist groups filed against the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (FERC) approval of the Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP).

MVP will draw on a vast amount of fracked natural gas from the Marcellus and Utica shale formations to supply up to two million dekatherms per day of transmission capacity to markets in the Mid- and South Atlantic regions of the United States. A dekatherm is the equivalent of one million British thermal units.

The DC Circuit’s February 19 ruling in Appalachian Voices v. FERC affirmed the commission’s decision to grant a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed 303-mile MVP, which would transport natural gas from Wetzel County, West Virginia to Pittsylvania County, Virginia.

Among the environmental groups challenging FERC’s action were Appalachian Voices, Chesapeake Climate Action Network, and the Sierra Club.

The court determined it was reasonable for FERC to conclude the pipeline was needed based on the fact 100 percent of the natural gas it would supply had already been contracted for on a long-term basis.

SCC Ruled Unnecessary

The court also upheld FERC’s decision to limit its estimates of carbon dioxide emissions from the project to those resulting from the end-use combustion of natural gas.

Petitioners argued FERC should have used a social cost of carbon metric in considering the climate change impacts of downstream greenhouse-gas emissions resulting from the transport of natural gas through the pipeline.

“All we need is for FERC to use a social cost of carbon metric,” Rucker said. “That’s why the court’s rejection of these petitions is both legally and environmentally sound.”

CRAIG RUCKER
PRESIDENT
COMMITTEE FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE TOMORROW

By Bonner R. Cohen
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Eminent Domain Affirmed

The court held FERC’s issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity satisfied the Fifth Amendment’s public use requirement.

The court stated the project’s eminent domain authority is consistent with the Fifth Amendment’s due process clause because landowners will be entitled to just compensation through a hearing process if the company acquires a right of way through private property.

‘Using Common Sense’

The court’s ruling is one step in defending the use of fossil fuels, which are necessary for U.S. economic progress, says Jay Lehr, a member of the International Climate Science Coalition’s Science Advisory Board.

“At least one U.S. court is using common sense, recognizing the folks who brought this case care little about the environment, simply dislike people benefitting from the United States’ vast fossil-fuel resources, and are intent on bringing down our nation with a thousand cuts,” Lehr said. “Thanks to the court, they have failed for a change.”

Thousands of wind turbines or solar arrays would be far worse for the environment of Virginia and West Virginia than the MVP, says Craig Rucker, president of the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow.

“Natural gas pipelines have been a prime target of environmental groups and politicians, such as New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo,” said Rucker. “This assault on our energy infrastructure serves many purposes, including creating more favorable conditions for their power sources of choice: wind and solar.

“Just imagine the damage done to the beautiful mountains of Virginia and West Virginia if they are plastered with wind turbines and solar arrays. That’s why the court’s rejection of these petitions is both legally and environmentally sound.”
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EPA’s Chemical Risk Assessments Rely on Flawed Science, Study Finds

By Linnea Luecken

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS), a program assessing the toxicity of chemicals and any risk from exposure to them, often produces assessments based on sloppy flawed science, a new study concludes.

The study’s author, Angela Logomasini, a senior fellow with the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), found IRIS has a long history of producing or citing poorly conducted risk assessments that lack transparency. All too often, using these faulty assessments, EPA has advanced flawed, counterproductive regulations that raise the costs of producing and using beneficial chemicals, Logomasini found.

Even when the federal government or state governments don’t use IRIS assessment to ban a particular chemical, the flawed results often result in unwarranted health scares that dissuade the public from using effective products, the study published by CEI reports.

**Overly Cautious Assessments**

EPA developed IRIS in 1986 to provide an agency-wide evaluation of chemical risks for use by all of EPA’s departments in assessing the need to regulate chemicals people may be exposed to. The goal was for IRIS to establish regulatory baselines for the concentrations and the appropriate use of chemicals to minimize risks associated with exposure to them.

Logomasini found IRIS has been “excessively cautious” in its assessments.

“EPA risk assessments, by and large, focus on preventing worst-case scenarios—even absurd ones—and ignore more plausible scenarios, while ignoring more serious risks created by the EPA’s own regulations,” Logomasini writes.

EPA identifies four steps necessary for an accurate risk assessment. For “Hazard Identification,” researchers consider whether a chemical has the potential to cause harm at some exposure level. A “Dose-Response Assessment” ascertains whether there is any relationship between exposure to the chemical and health conditions. “Exposure Assessment” analyzes whether the dose-response evidence shows a connection between a health risk and a chemical, and if so, at what level of exposure. “Risk Characterization” uses information collected in the prior three steps to assess actual risk levels based on realistic assessments of the public’s exposure to the chemical.

IRIS conducts only the first two steps of the risk assessment, yet based on this incomplete assessment it ranks the potential carcinogenicity of chemicals and estimates non-cancer risks. IRIS rankings are often based on research that lacks transparency, resulting in other researchers being unable to confirm the assessments by testing the underlying data, Logomasini reports.

**Not the Gold Standard**

Proponents tout IRIS as the most comprehensive, accurate chemical risk assessment, but it is not, says Logomasini.

“IRIS supporters say it sets the ‘gold standard’ for risk assessment, when the opposite is true,” Logomasini told Environment & Climate News. “The program has failed to develop rational, useful risk assessments, opting to select absurd risk values that create unwarranted public health scares, harming the public.”

Logomasini cites IRIS assessment of the chemical ethylene oxide, which is commonly used to sterilize medical equipment, as one not based on good science, which may cause hospitals to use less-effective sterilization programs and potentially put patients at risk of infection or illness from exposure to unsterile equipment.

“IRIS’s 2018 assessment for the chemical ethylene oxide set a standard that is 19,000 times lower than levels of this chemical produced in the human body, which is ridiculous,” Logomasini said. “As result of this excessively cautious standard, the State of Illinois shut down a facility that uses ethylene oxide to sterilize medical equipment. There is no evidence trace levels of ethylene oxide found in a few areas near the plant have harmed anyone, yet the Illinois prohibition, based on EPA’s IRIS assessment, may end up killing people by exposing them to improperly or incompletely sterilized medical equipment,” Logomasini said.

“Unwarranted fear of minute exposure to ethylene oxide has led to needless bans and regulations that could wind up being deadly.”

**‘Linear No Threshold’ Threat**

EPA uses toxicology poorly to make people believe substances they may be exposed to are more dangerous than they really are, says Dr. John Dale Dunn, an emergency physician, researcher, and policy advisor to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

“Citing IRIS, EPA uses schlocky, junk toxicology to create health scares, making people think the whole world is a dangerous place, when in fact the Earth is a very safe place,” Dunn said. “Ambient levels of even the most awful toxins are not levels where you can say people face a terrible risk from exposure and they should be concerned about it.”

Dunn says IRIS assessments do not meet baseline conditions of good epidemiology for proving a substance causes illness in certain populations.

“In order to have what is called robust research evidence of causation, you have to have at least a doubling of the rate of illness in the studied population,” said Dunn. “In order to prove causation, you have to have higher rates of association—three times or four times. “With less than a doubling of the rate of illness, they are making claims of causation; and worse, without any foundation in research, EPA claims there is ‘no safe limit’ for exposure to many chemicals once the agency has established tumors can be produced in laboratory animals exposed to substances at unbelievably high doses, regularly, over extended periods of time, which does not at all correspond to real-world exposure,” Dunn said. “It’s called the ‘linear no threshold’ theory of toxicology, which is a misuse of science in a way that ultimately negatively impacts human health.”

Linnea Lueken (linnea.heartland@gmail.com) writes from South Carolina.

**INTERNET INFO**

A story about climate change for kids
Free Download
kids4biz.com/warmthis

Michael Malgeri has created a series of small books that could change the way an entire generation views individualism, profit-making, and capitalism.

Joseph Bast
Director and Senior Fellow
The Heartland Institute
Taxing Rain and Everything Else in New Jersey

Editor’s Note: First-term New Jersey state Assemblyman Hal Wirths (R-Hardyston Township) serves on the Appropriations and Labor committees and on the Telecommunications and Utilities Committee. Before being elected to the General Assembly, Wirths served on the New Jersey Parole Board, as a Commissioner of the N.J. Department of Labor and Workforce Development, on the N.J. Ethics Commission, and as a member of the N.J. Economic Development Authority.

By H. Sterling Burnett

Burnett: New Jersey recently enacted what has been referred to as a "rain tax." What is that, and why did you oppose it?

Wirths: The rain tax allows counties or municipalities to collect fees to pay for managing storm water or for them to set up a utility authority that can impose fees on owners of properties with large areas of impervious cover, such as parking lots and rooftops of malls, apartments, and commercial developments. There is no cap on the tax, so there is no stopping it from rising over time. Different cities and counties can set up their tax or taxing authorities differently.

Every major study ranks New Jersey as having the highest property taxes, worst overall tax climate, and as being one of the least affordable states to live in and start a business in, which is why former Gov. Chris Christie vetoed a similar bill when he was in power and why I, coming from a business background, got fired up and vocally opposed the creation of the rain tax.

The same day the Democrats passed the rain tax, they also passed a property tax hike to fund arts and culture; they hiked the state’s minimum wage, which will also almost certainly result in an increase in property taxes—already the highest in the nation—since the increase applies to workers for the state, for counties, municipalities, and school districts; imposed fee increases for paperwork at the County Clerk’s office; and instituted a tax on parking tickets, a hike in payroll taxes, and a tax on jet fuel which will cause prices of airline tickets to rise.

I opposed the rain tax and the other taxes because the flood of taxes is just never-ending here in Trenton.

Burnett: As I’m sure you are aware, regulations act as hidden taxes, and New Jersey has one of the highest regulatory burdens in the nation. What steps should the legislature take to change that?

Wirths: New Jersey is a regulatory hellhole. I served in Gov. Christie’s cabinet, and I am proud to say that in his eight years in office we most likely had the least amount of new administrative rules of any modern-day gubernatorial administration. He established the Red Tape Review Committee headed by the lieutenant governor, which took testimony from individuals, business owners, and government officials and led to legislative reforms enacted during his tenure.

Under Gov. [Phil] Murphy, this committee was allowed to lapse, and regulations are expanding once again, which is why I am cosponsoring legislation to make the Red Tape Review Committee permanent.

Burnett: New Jersey Sen. Cory Booker (D), a candidate for the Democratic nomination for president, has thrown his support behind the “Green New Deal,” which would require ending the use of fossil fuels, encourages getting rid of cows and stopping meat eating, and would require the federal government to reshape the entire economy radically, all in just 10 years. What are your thoughts on that proposal?

Wirths: I am not giving up my burgers, I can tell you that! The Green New Deal is all about the federal government taking control over the entire economy and our daily lives, period. It’s not really green—more like Soviet red.

It is one of the worst legislative initiatives ever proposed in Congress. America was founded on liberty and freedom, and the Green New Deal runs contrary to everything our country is about.

We didn’t win the Cold War to turn America into Venezuela, and whatever I can do not only as an elected official but as an American to defeat this Green New Deal permanently, I will.

Burnett: Previous Gov. Chris Christie withdrew New Jersey from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative under which northeastern states charge fees for permission to emit carbon dioxide. Murphy is taking steps to force New Jersey to rejoin RGGI, and electric power rates have subsequently risen. What are your thoughts on Murphy’s decision to rejoin RGGI?

Wirths: I wholeheartedly supported Gov. Christie’s 2011 decision to pull New Jersey out of RGGI. Unfortunately, legislation which I support to permanently withdraw New Jersey from RGGI was never acted upon.

Now, Gov. Murphy has announced the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection is issuing rules to force New Jersey to participate in RGGI once again.

Gov. Murphy and the Democrats, despite my opposition, have enacted a number of bills which will lead to increases in the price of electricity for New Jersey ratepayers in order to subsidize “clean energy.”

For instance, A. 3723 establishes new and modifies existing state clean energy and energy efficiency programs and modifies New Jersey’s solar renewable energy portfolio standards; S. 1217 requires New Jersey’s Board of Public Utilities to consider and approve an amended application for a qualified wind energy project offshore in certain N.J. territorial waters; and S. 598 requires New Jersey to join the U.S. Climate Alliance to uphold the Paris Climate Accord, which President Donald Trump wisely is withdrawing the nation from.

H. Sterling Burnett, Ph.D. (hsburnett@heartland.org) is a research fellow at The Heartland Institute.
Air Emissions, Toxic Releases Reduced, EPA Reports

By Bonner R. Cohen

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released reports showing air pollution and the amount of toxins released into the environment continue to decline nationwide.

An EPA report detailing the ongoing decline in regulated air pollutants from power plants announced emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) declined 4 percent below their 2017 levels in 2018. Sulfur dioxide (SO2) emissions from power plants in the lower 48 states declined 6 percent during the same period.

These improvements occurred even as demand for electricity increased by 5 percent in 2018 as a result of strong economic growth.

“These data show that America is enjoying ever-cleaner air as our economy grows, and the U.S. continues as a global leader in clean air progress,” said Bill Wehrum, EPA assistant administrator for air and radiation, in a February 20 statement accompanying the report’s release. “Through state and federal fulfillment with the Clean Air Act, and advances by the power sector, we’ve seen significant reductions in key pollutants while electricity generation has increased.”

Long-Term Gains Continue

The report indicates the air quality improvement in 2018 was a continuation of a long-term trend. From 1990 through 2018, annual emissions of SO2 from power plants fell by 92 percent and annual emissions of NOx from power plants declined by 84 percent.

Going back even farther, the EPA reports from 1970 to 2017 the combined emissions of six key pollutants regulated under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards dropped by 73 percent, even as the population increased and the U.S. economy grew by more than 260 percent.

Air quality in the United States is already sufficient to ensure public health, and ongoing reductions hurt the economy for no real benefit, says David Wojick, Ph.D., a senior policy analyst with the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow and a policy advisor to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

“Unfortunately, the reductions in NOx and SO2 emissions are both expensive and unnecessary, hence nothing to brag about,” Wojick said. “NOx is reduced by cutting power plant efficiency, in a hopeless attempt to push urban ozone concentrations below natural background levels.

“SO2 reductions are related to the old acid-rain scare,” said Wojick. “Decreasing SO2 emissions has been accomplished either by switching to low-grade, low-sulfur western coal or retrofitting power plants with expensive scrubbers. NOx and SO2 reductions have been part of the 30-year war on coal, so success is not something to celebrate.”

Toxics Declining As Well

In another report, EPA announced the release of toxic chemicals from industrial activities also continued to decline in 2017.

EPA’s 2017 Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) National Analysis, released on March 5, 2019, reports releases of TRI chemicals from the U.S. manufacturing sector have declined substantially since 2007 even though the economy has grown.

The latest TRI data, submitted by nearly 22,000 facilities nationwide, show continued improvement in pollution management and reduction. The report notes, for example, airborne releases of regulated chemicals declined by 11 million pounds in 2017, and air releases of TRI chemicals have fallen 57 percent at industrial facilities since 2007. In addition, since 2007, using such practices as recycling, recovery, and treatment, regulated facilities have prevented 87 percent of the nearly 31 billion pounds of regulated chemical wastes from being released into the environment.

Economic, Environmental Compatibility

EPA says its TRI report demonstrates economic growth and environmental improvement are compatible.

“This year’s TRI results give proof that economic growth and an improved environment can go hand in hand,” said Alexandra Dapolito Dunn, assistant administrator in EPA’s Office of Pollution Prevention and Chemical Safety, in a statement.

The United States should get the credit it deserves for leading the way in environmental protection, says Jay Lehr, Ph.D., a member of the International Climate Science Coalition’s Science Advisory Board.

“This is incredibly good but not unexpected news,” said Lehr. “The public needs to wake up and recognize no nation works harder than the United States, through its industries and its government, to provide its citizens with the cleanest environment on Earth.

“We have succeeded at this for decades now, but the press only reports our rare failures,” Lehr said. “It is time for Americans to stand up and applaud what we, collectively, consistently accomplish for the environment.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research and a senior policy analyst with the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow.
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Environmentalists Are Using Bees for a Steroid-Infused Land Grab

By Paul Driessen

Environmental special interests were stung recently by a unanimous U.S. Supreme Court decision ruling owners of private land cannot be compelled to forego future economic uses of their property or convert their land into suitable habitat for an endangered frog at their own expense.

Ignoring this win for property rights, radical greens are now eyeing even bigger land grabs.

Bee Suit

In the latest of many Endangered Species Act (ESA) lawsuits involving insects, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) sued the U.S. Department of the Interior for declining to designate “critical habitat” for the “endangered” rusty patched bumblebee (RPB), which the Obama administration designated as endangered just before leaving office in January 2017.

NRDC says Interior must designate habitats based on “best available evidence,” but Interior points out the extremely limited knowledge about RPBs makes critical habitat determinations impossible.

Activists claim RPB populations declined beginning in the mid-1990s because of habitat loss, disease, climate change, and especially the use of crop-protecting pesticides.

Habitat Loss, Disease

In 2013, when petitioning the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) for endangered status for the RPB, the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation said the bee’s decline was due to habitat loss and multiple diseases spreading from domesticated honeybees to wild bees.

“The exact cause for the loss of the rusty patched is unclear,” says University of Virginia biology professor Tai Roulston. “But it’s almost certainly related to disease,” especially a fungal gut parasite that “can shorten the lives of worker bees and disrupt mating success and survival of queens and males.”

Habitat loss is another factor. Over the past half-century, cities and suburbs have expanded and farmers increasingly have emphasized large-scale monoculture crops such as corn and canola for food and biofuels, reducing underground RPB nesting sites and the varieties of flowers wild bees prefer.

Obama’s FWS ignored these factors, downplaying the disease and habitat loss played in RPB decline, and instead blaming pesticides, especially advanced-technology neonicotinoid pesticides (neonics).

Anti-Pesticide Claims Refuted

The evidence refutes claims pesticides are responsible for the bee decline.

An international study of wild bees in Nature Communications found only 2 percent of wild bee species are responsible for 80 percent of all crop visits. Most wild bees never even come into contact with crops or the pesticides that supposedly harm them.

Even more compelling, the Nature study determined the 2 percent of wild bees that do visit crops, and so would be most exposed to pesticides, are among the healthiest bee species on Earth.

Other studies found neonic pesticide residues are well below levels that can adversely affect bee development or reproduction, because most neonics are used as seed coatings, being absorbed into plant tissue as crops grow. Neonics target only pests that actually feed on crops or the pesticides that supposedly harm them.

What About Wind?

Hypocritically, these same eco-activists express few concerns about bald and golden eagles, other bird species, and multiple rare bat species currently being decimated by wind turbines.

The resulting carnage is ignored by greens and regulators alike, while Big Wind operators prohibit independent biologists from entering the killing grounds to get accurate counts of bird and bat carcasses.

Many bird and bat species could be wiped out entirely if anything like the GND sprouts hundreds of thousands of 400-foot-tall onshore turbines across the country.

These cases underscore why the ESA must be revised to improve the science used in species listing and habitat designation decisions, and to ensure the human toll of ESA listing decisions is taken into account.

Paul Driessen (pkdriessen@gmail.com) is a senior policy advisor with the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow.

“Other anti-pesticide, anti-fossil-fuel, pro-Green New Deal activists want beetles and other bugs designated as endangered. It’s all about control. The ultimate effect would be to let radical groups use insects designated as ‘threatened or endangered’ to delay or veto countless projects and activities across nearly the entire United States.”
Trump’s Tweets Highlight Climate Contradictions

By H. Sterling Burnett

As a polar vortex held much of the nation in its icy grip, with record-low temperatures recorded in many locations, President Donald Trump ridiculed global warming alarmism.

Trump tweeted, “In the beautiful Midwest, windchill temperatures are reaching minus 60 degrees, the coldest ever recorded. In coming days, expected to get even colder. People can’t last outside even for minutes. What the hell is going on with Global Warming? Please come back fast, we need you!”

Obama-era holdovers at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) immediately tweeted in response, “Winter storms don’t prove that global warming isn’t happening.”

The mainstream media parroted NOAA’s response, noting no single cold spell or winter storm is proof humans aren’t causing global warming.

Weather Is Not Climate

It’s certainly true there is a difference between weather and climate. However, climate alarmists and their lapdogs in the mainstream media somehow fail to remember this fact every year when they breathlessly claim a single flood or hurricane, a busy hurricane season, or a large wildfire shows humans are causing dangerous climate change. Guess what? Those events are just weather too.

A region’s climate is its geology, topography, and weather patterns and history measured and/or averaged over long periods. We have had record-setting polar vortex events three of the last five years. Could it be a trend?

The way to find out is to look at potential causes. NASA recently noted record-low sunspot activity could portend an extended period of below-average temperatures. As reported in the American Thinker, “Martin Mlynczak of NASA’s Langley Research Center reported in September: ‘High above Earth’s surface, near the edge of space, our atmosphere is losing heat energy. If current trends continue, it could soon set a Space Age record for cold.’”

Contradictory Climate Claims

Although winter storms don’t prove global warming isn’t happening, they do contradict predictions made by many of the same climate change charlatans just a few years ago that human-caused climate change would make snow nonexistent, or nearly so, in the near future.

Although winter storms don’t prove global warming isn’t happening, they do contradict predictions made by many of the same climate change charlatans just a few years ago that human-caused climate change would make snow nonexistent, or nearly so, in the near future.

‘Shut Up,’ They Explained

When confronted with facts casting doubt on aspects of the theory of human-caused climate change, climate alarmists revert to ad hominem attacks, calling the researchers providing such evidence insulting names or questioning their motives instead of addressing the substance of their arguments.

This response is a hallmark of doctrinaire religious zealots, not of scientists engaged in an honest exchange of ideas in pursuit of knowledge.

H. Sterling Burnett, Ph.D. (hburnett@heartland.org) is a senior fellow on energy and the environment at The Heartland Institute, a nonpartisan, nonprofit research center headquartered in Arlington Heights, Illinois. An earlier version of this article was published in the Madison St. Clair Record. Reprinted with permission.
At the Arthur B. Robinson Center on Climate and Environmental Policy at The Heartland Institute, we are producing the research and conducting the effective advocacy needed to help restore sound science and common sense to efforts to protect the environment.

The center promotes pro-energy, pro-environment, and pro-jobs policies based on sound science and economics, not alarmism or ideology.

Through events, publications, social media, and government relations programs we have changed public opinion on climate change and other environmental topics. We have changed public policy not only in the United States but in other countries as well.

In 2018 and onward, we are focusing on winning the global warming war and repealing bad legislation and regulations adopted during the height of the global warming scare.

With your help, we can succeed. Please contact us at 312/377-4000 or think@heartland.org, or visit our website at heartland.org/Center-Climate-Environment.

“The Heartland Institute has published the work of many excellent scientists ... [and] has taken the fight right to the enemy with aggressive and highly effective campaigns aimed at elected officials and civic and business leaders.”

ARTHUR B. ROBINSON, PH.D.
APRIL 2017

The center is named in honor of, and chaired by, Arthur B. Robinson, Ph.D., a distinguished chemist, cofounder of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine (OISM), and editor of the influential newsletter Access to Energy. He received a Ph.D. in chemistry from the University of California at San Diego.
U.S. Senate Public Lands Bill Would Designate 1.3 Million Acres as Wilderness

By Kenneth Artz

A sweeping public lands conservation bill that would lock up more than one million acres in California, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah as wilderness and impose additional permanent protections on federal lands in Montana, Washington, and other states passed the U.S. Senate.

The Natural Resources Management Act (NRMA) includes provisions from 170 previously proposed bills and affects virtually every state. Among its provisions, it designates 1.3 million acres as wilderness and permanently reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which draws revenues from offshore oil and gas drilling, to purchase land for federal ownership. Roads and motorized vehicles would be prohibited on the newly declared wilderness areas, along with other restrictions on their use and enjoyment.

Restrictions would also be imposed on the use of more than 200 miles of a river traversing Massachusetts and Connecticut and almost 300 miles of rivers in Oregon that NRMA declares “wild, scenic, or recreational.”

The bill passed in March would also create three new national monuments: the Medgar and Myrlie Evers Home National Monument in Jackson, Mississippi and the Mill Springs National Monument and Camp Nelson National Monument, both in Kentucky.

The next stop for the bill is the House of Representatives, where it enjoys bipartisan support.

Absentee Fed Ownership

The federal government already owns too much land in Western states, says John Charles, president of the Cascade Policy Institute.

“The federal government owns 55 percent of Oregon, so we’re already a colony of Washington, D.C.,” Charles said. “Most federal land sits there waiting for a catastrophic forest fire because you can’t really do anything with it.

“In my mind there is no reason for any state to have more than half its land mass owned by the feds,” said Charles.

Criticizes Feds’ Land Management

The federal government has already demonstrated it owns too much land to manage properly, says Charles.

“From my standpoint, it’s very obvious the federal government has been a very poor manager of the lands it controls,” Charles said. “The legal overlay of the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and other land management agencies have to work under results in vast areas of land waiting around for a catastrophic wildfire due to improper management.

“When you have lands where there’s something unusual or unique, maybe a wilderness designation is justified, but many of these areas just don’t have such unique features,” Charles said.

Calls for Transfer to States

Charles says governors and legislators from western states should strongly encourage their colleagues from eastern states to transfer some of the federal government’s holdings to state or private ownership.

“It would be great if the feds would transfer at least some federally owned lands to the state of Oregon or simply auction them off to private purchasers, that would be much better than leaving them to rot or burn under federal management.”

JOHN CHARLES
PRESIDENT, CASCADE POLICY INSTITUTE

The Book that Set the Trump EPA’s Agenda

The U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) claims that outdoor air kills hundreds of thousands of Americans every year. EPA has used this claim to: wreck the coal industry; justify expensive and job-killing air quality and climate rules; and to scare Americans about the air they breathe. Milloy not only debunks the outrageous EPA’s claims and exposes them as rank scientific fraud in no uncertain terms, but offers a roadmap for fixing the rogue and out-of-control EPA.

Available on Amazon $15.95

#1 Amazon.com Best Seller (Public Affairs)
Each month, Environment & Climate News updates the global averaged satellite measurements of the Earth’s temperature. These numbers are important because they are real—not projections, forecasts, or guesses. Global satellite measurements are made from a series of orbiting platforms that sense the average temperature in various atmospheric layers. Here, we present the lowest level, which climate models say should be warming. The satellite measurements are considered accurate to within 0.01°C. The data used to create these graphs can be found on the Internet at http://vortex.nsstc.uah.edu/data/msu/v6.0beta/tlt/uahncdc_lt_6.0beta5.txt. All past data were revised when the methodology was updated in April 2015.
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The global average temperature was 0.36°C above average.

The Southern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.26°C above average.

The Northern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.46°C above average.
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The Western is an anachronism. I know it’s fascist. I know it’s sexist. I know it’s evil and out of date. But, God help me, I love it so.

—Sam Peckinpah
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