Massachusetts Loses Climate Action Case Brought by Four Teenagers

By Kenneth Artz

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) failed to comply with its legal obligation to reduce the state’s greenhouse-gas emissions, according to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, which ruled in favor of four teenagers supported by Our Children’s Trust, the Conservation Law Foundation, and the Mass Energy Consumers Alliance.

The court ordered DEP to create regulations addressing multiple sources or categories of sources of greenhouse-gas emissions. The court also mandated DEP impose a limit on released emissions and set limits that decline annually. Currently, Massachusetts is not on track to meet its 2020 greenhouse-gas-reduction goal of cutting emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels.

The court’s action did not surprise David Schnare, MASSACHUSETTS, p. 4
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EPA Raises 2017 Ethanol Mandate

By Ann N. Purvis

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) proposed 2017 renewable fuel standard (RFS) would raise the amount of biofuels required to be blended into gasoline and diesel from 18.11 billion gallons in 2016 to 18.8 billion gallons.

While the 2017 mandate is 3.8 percent higher than the 2016 level, it remains below the 24-billion-gallon biofuel target Congress established in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act. The law allows EPA to set lower target levels if market or technological conditions justify it. As it has in previous years, EPA cited market conditions for setting the lower levels.

Cellulosic Biofuels Lag Behind

One reason the country has been unable to meet the targets is a consistent shortage of cellulosic ethanol—ethanol produced using wood, grasses, or the inedible parts of plants.

“There’s really just no way the 2007 mandates are plausible today,” said Isaac Orr, research fellow at The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “The government was trying encourage the development of advanced biofuels, basically using, wood, grasses, and other inedible parts of plants in order to help meet the RFS. Frankly, we’ve not been able to produce any meaningful amount of cellulosic ethanol, so they have had to waive that requirement.”

Cellulosic biofuel has long been an issue when it comes to meeting RFS targets, because there’s often a stark difference between expected production and actual production. When Heritage Foundation Fellow Nicolas Loris testified before two U.S. House of Representatives subcommittees in March 2016, he described how EPA had been forced to reduce the legislative goal for cellulosic fuel in 2010 from 100 million gallons to just 6.5 million. Even that amount was unobtainable, as no cellulosic biofuel was produced in 2010.

A 2015 Congressional Research Service report notes cellulosic fuel production failed to match even EPA’s reduced mandates in 2011 and 2012. In 2013, EPA reduced the 1 billion gallon goal for cellulosic fuels to just 6 million gallons, but only 48,846 gallons were actually produced that year.

Breaking the Blend Wall

Orr says too much ethanol in the nation’s fuel supply risks breaching the “blend wall,” the maximum amount of ethanol that can be safely blended into gasoline. Most car engines, unless they are specifically designed to handle high-ethanol blends, cannot accommodate fuel containing more than 10 percent ethanol. Amounts above this level risk engine damage. For smaller motors, such as boats or lawnmowers, damage occurs even at the 10 percent level. “Small engines really aren’t equipped to handle more than small amounts of ethanol,” said Orr.

The Institute for Energy Research says EPA’s 2017 proposal goes beyond the blend wall, meaning while flex-fuel vehicles can accommodate E15 and E85 blends—fuels with 15 percent and 85 percent ethanol, respectively—the vast majority of vehicles on roads would suffer damage using this much ethanol.

Market Implications

In addition to causing engine damage, ethanol actually costs more per mile than gasoline. “The price of ethanol may be lower, but it only contains two-thirds of the energy in a gallon of gasoline,” said Orr, meaning drivers have to fill up their vehicles more often because of the lower energy-efficiency levels. Those costs can add up. The Institute for Energy Research estimates Americans spend an additional $10 billion annually due to the presence of ethanol in fuel.

These costs are separate from the general market disruptions caused by the RFS mandate, which also include increased food and feed prices. Vehicles’ inability to accommodate higher levels of ethanol, the decreased efficiency and higher costs of the fuel, and the market distortions for food have led groups such as the American Petroleum Institute, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Energy Alliance, and National Restaurant Association, among others, to call for an end to the ethanol mandate.

Ann N. Purvis (ann.n.purvis@gmail.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Mass. Loses Climate Case Brought by Young People

Continued from page 1

general counsel at the Energy & Environment Legal Institute, who says the court did not pass judgment concerning whether climate change was happening or harmful. Rather, it was simply enforcing the law.

“All the [Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court] did was a routine function to force the legislature to do what it was required to do by law,” said Schnare. “The court did not say climate change was a horrible thing, rather it ruled [the] state had not done its job under the law and told them to do it.”

The Massachusetts decision comes in the wake of a similar case, which was also decided in favor of environmentalists, this time by a court in Washington State in April 2016. In that lawsuit, brought by seven teenagers against the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE), the judge ruled WDOE had to promulgate an emissions reduction rule by the end of 2016 and, in consultation with the youth petitioners, recommend additional greenhouse-gas reductions for the state legislature to consider adopting during the 2017 legislative session.

Other youth-led lawsuits, all supported by Our Children’s Trust, are pending in Colorado, North Carolina, and Oregon.

Mislead on Climate Change

Tom Harris, executive director of the International Climate Science Coalition, said, “The United Nations spends about $1 billion a day to fight climate change, yet only 6 percent of the money goes to adaptation to help people who are suffering with real problems today, and that’s where the real crime is.”

Students and others are not getting all the facts, Harris says. “What we really need to be asking is, ‘Is known suffering of people today more important than possible suffering of unborn people in the future?’ Most people have never thought about climate change this way, and the kids are all focused on possible future suffering. This is an absolute crime.”

TOM HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COALITION

“Higher Energy Prices

Harris says if Massachusetts reduces its emission levels by the amounts required by law, the cost of energy will go up, because the state will have to phase out the use of coal to generate electricity.

“The number-one factor in the rising cost of electricity is the phasing out of coal,” said Harris. “People will have to pay more for electricity, and this will disproportionately harm the poor, who will have to pay a greater portion of their budgets for heat and to cool their homes.”

Kids Being Propagandized

Marc Morano, executive director of ClimateDepot, a project of the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow, says the environmental movement is attempting to indoctrinate today’s youth.

“It’s a brilliant tactic by the environmental left,” Morano said. “It gives the kids something tangible they can hold on to and it radicalizes them about the environment early on. However, kids are being spoon-fed a version of science that does not comport with reality.

“The environmental left carefully censors or bans opposing ideas, like in Portland, Oregon, where you now can’t even mention in school textbooks climate change may not be as bad as we thought,” Morano said.

“Accurate climate science is being suppressed, meaning the kids don’t get to hear opposing views,” said Morano. “It’s narrative-crafting, the same kind of thing you would expect from any partisan campaign group.

“And then you add in the media, with people like Leonardo DiCaprio and Laurie David telling kids if you’re a global warming skeptic, you are not cool,” said Morano. “I guess they’re afraid the kids will instantly become skeptics if they hear any opposing ideas.”

Kenneth Artz (kartz@heartland.org) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Why Endangered Species Delisting Process Is Failing

By Kenneth Artz

Witnesses at a U.S. House Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing in April testified the Endangered Species Act (ESA) lacks a proper process for delisting species, which they say results in many species remaining on the Endangered Species List when they do not belong there.

There are currently 2,258 species protected under ESA, and only 63 have been delisted since the law’s enactment in 1973. Joel Bousman, vice president of the Western Interstate Region of the National Association of Counties, testified at the hearing, saying, “When a species is put on the Endangered Species Act list, it’s a bit like checking into the Hotel California. You can check out anytime you like, but you can never leave.”

Lawsuits, Deadlines Prioritize Listing

Two reasons cited for ESA’s poor track record of delisting species by several of those testifying were strict deadlines for making listing decisions and ESA’s citizen-suit provisions.

Maryland attorney Lowell E. Baier testified, “[ESA’s] citizen-suit provision ... has made federal courts a venue where extreme organizations ... can twist the Endangered Species Act and bend the federal government to their will. Part of their agenda is to always increase the number of species and amount of land protected under the Endangered Species Act, and so they have used the courts to oppose delisting of recovered species.”

Ron Arnold, executive vice president of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, says ESA’s citizen-suit provisions have been used as part of a backdoor effort to control land use.

“Contrary to what people may think, the ESA has nothing to do with animals,” said Arnold. “Instead, it is a land-use control bill that declares if you disturb the habitat of an ESA-listed animal, you can get one year in jail and a $50,000 fine for every violation.

“The whole thing boils down to using the ESA’s regulatory power to control industry,” said Arnold. “Delisting harms anyone who gets foundation grants to expand the ESA’s reach, so it’s in their interest to make sure no species ever gets delisted from the ESA.”

Wyoming rancher and attorney Karen Budd-Falen focused in her testimony on how lawsuits force the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to focus their attention on listing decisions and deemphasize delisting.

 “[T]he FWS’s documents prove that litigation is driving the agency’s priorities, not sound science or administrative determinations,” testified Budd-Falen. “For example, a memorandum prepared by the assistant director for ecological services of the FWS in May 20, 2014, states that the priorities of the FWS will be to focus on court-ordered and settlement deadlines.”

Budd-Falen says developing a species recovery plan as required by the law is not a priority for FWS, because ESA “establishes no timeframe to develop a recovery plan. All the Act mandates [is] that one be developed; no timeframe is given ...”

ESA contains very strict timeframes for listing species and designating critical habitat and constant litigation drains FWS’s budgets.

“Violation of those timeframes has and will continue to result in significant litigation, resulting in significant payment of attorney’s fees to environmental groups bringing such litigation,” Budd-Falen said in her testimony.

Punitive Approach Hampers Recovery

Brian Seasholes, director of the Endangered Species Project at the Reason Foundation, says the ultimate goal of ESA should be to recover species, which means they should then be delisted.

“The ESA takes a punitive approach to conservation, creating perverse incentives for private landowners to choose not to cooperate, which is unfortunate because many ESA species are on private land,” Seasholes said.

“The punitive, conflict-ridden approach of the ESA ensures few will voluntarily cooperate with the ESA,” said Seasholes. “Imagine if the ESA was trying to help homeless people. Under the current arrangement, the ESA wouldn’t give you any help or money if the homeless showed up on your doorstep. Instead, you might get fined or shut down when they do if you don’t provide for their upkeep.

“This is what happens to farmers and landowners when endangered species are located on the property, so you can understand why landowners are reluctant [to] admit an endangered species might be on the property and often manage their land to make it unattractive to species,” Seasholes said.

Kenneth Artz (kartz@heartland.org) writes from Dallas, Texas.
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**Fish and Wildlife Service to Grant 30-year Permits to Kill Protected Eagles**

By Michael McGrady

Under a rule proposed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), renewable-energy companies will be able to obtain permits authorizing protected eagles to be killed or captured over the next 30 years.

The proposed rule is part of the Obama administration’s plan to expand wind and solar energy development.

The rule would provide to renewable-energy companies protection from criminal or civil prosecution or penalties for incidental deaths of protected bald and golden eagles that occur as a result of the normal operations of wind and solar farms. The proposed 30 years of protection from legal liability would replace the five years of protection FWS currently grants to renewable-energy facilities.

“The proposed regulations address the duration of permits for incidental take of eagles, extending the maximum permit duration to 30 years, subject to a recurring five-year review process throughout the permit life,” an FWS press release stated.

The rule, if adopted, would also require companies to self-audit the capturing of eagles and report their findings to FWS every five years.

**Plan Denied in the Past**

A similar rule proposed by FWS in 2013 was rejected by a federal judge in August 2015. The judge wrote while he recognized “promoting renewable energy projects may well be a ‘worthy’ goal,” FWS failed to meet procedural obligations. Under the 1970 National Environmental Policy Act and 1973 Endangered Species Act, FWS is required to conduct a full environmental review assessing the long-term possibility of harming to federally protected eagles.

**Bird Advocates Not On Board**

Michael Hutchins, national coordinator of the Bird Smart Wind Energy Program, an advocacy program of the American Bird Conservancy, says industries and other stakeholders are not being treated equally in this situation.

“It’s a somewhat disturbing yet interesting situation,” Hutchins said. “Eagles are an iconic species and they are our national symbol.

“I don’t think all industries are being treated equally here,” said Hutchins. “If you are going to regulate, you need to regulate equally.”

In an article published in the Citizens Voice, titled “It’s Open Season on Bald Eagles,” Pennsylvania resident Bob Quarteroni says the “ugly” plan would allow wind farms to kill up to 4,200 bald eagles each year and that it should be avoided.

“[J]ust when you think the government can’t get any more ugly, they prove you wrong. Why are they doing this? To help the wind turbine industry. What a surprise,” wrote Quarteroni.

Michael McGrady (mmcgrady@uccs.edu) writes from Colorado Springs, Colorado.
Genetically Engineered Crops Safe, Report Says

By Kenneth Artz

Genetically modified (GM) crops, agricultural plants that have had their DNA modified using genetic engineering techniques, are safe to eat and do not harm the environment, according to a report issued in May by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

The report also found farmers planting GM cotton, maize, and soybean generally benefitted economically. For instance, farmers using crops genetically modified to contain the insect-resistant Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) suffered fewer crop losses and used less insecticide. Widespread planting of Bt crops decreased the number of some agricultural pests regionally, resulting in reduced crop damage even on fields not planted with Bt crops.

According to the report, it is unclear whether the technology is better for the climate than conventionally grown crops.

The report’s release comes as the federal government is reviewing how it regulates biotech crops.

Moving Past the Process

Hank Campbell, president of the American Council on Science and Health, said, “It’s time to move past the process in America and focus on results. Organic crops are just a means of self-identification, costing more while offering no special benefits when compared to GM crops.”

“Perhaps people will find a biological pathway where anything is expressed differently in humans who consume GM fruits and vegetables,” Campbell said.

Fighting Global Warming

Mischa Popoff, a former organic farmer and former U.S. Department of Agriculture-accredited organic crop inspector, says he has never understood the thinking behind the argument GM crops are “good for climate.”

“No one has, no one can, and no one will be able to find a biological pathway where organic crops do better in the natural environment than old-fashioned landlines, but we use cell phones because they’re convenient, not because of any environmental benefit.”

Monsanto is the leading proponent of the view GM crops help battle man-made climate change, and Popoff says Monsanto should be called out on it.

“This is an understandable marketing ploy: trying to gain public acceptance by playing into widespread-but-misguided fears of climate change,” said Popoff. “However, it harms the public’s understanding of how and why civilizations adopt new technology.”

“The only thing worse than an organic activist who attacks GM crops [by] pretending they threaten organic crops is a GM crop executive who defends GM crops using fears of human-caused climate change to garner support.”

Kenneth Artz (kartz@heartland.org) writes from Dallas, Texas.
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Department of Energy Cancels Funding for Texas Clean Energy Coal Project

By Michael McGrady

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has decided to cease funding the Texas Clean Energy Project (TCEP), one of six clean-coal-energy projects promised under DOE’s Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI).

The DOE cited an inspector general’s report showing the project was well over budget and behind schedule when announcing its decision to cease funding the project on May 13, 2016. The original funding agreement, finalized in 2010, capped federal spending at $15 million during the preliminary phase, a limit it exceeded by $101 million. According to the inspector general’s report, “As of February 2016, the Department had invested about $116 million in the Project without assurances that it would succeed.”

Under the Obama administration, DOE has spent $4.8 billion on carbon capture and storage technologies under CCPI, including six major demonstration projects aimed at capturing at least 90 percent of carbon-dioxide emissions at each plant per year.

Unable to secure significant non-government funding, DOE’s suspension of funding amounts to a death knell for the Texas project. This means five of the six carbon capture and storage projects, which combined have received $1.25 billion in federal funds, have been canceled or suspended.

Like other CCPI projects, TCEP sought to develop and demonstrate the success of carbon capture and storage (CCS), a process by which a facility generating carbon-dioxide emissions would capture those emissions, preventing them from entering the atmosphere.

The development of commercially viable CCS technology has proven more expensive and difficult than the federal government initially expected. Each of the cancelled CCPI projects failed in large part due to a failure to meet budget requirements, because they fell far behind schedule, or both.

“While I appreciate the Obama administration offering a benefit to an industry it has all but killed, I oppose subsidies,” said Marita Noon, executive director of Energy Makes America Great. “However, the primary problem is not with the CCS technology or subsidies, it is with the government’s goal itself.”

“CCS attempts to eliminate a colorless, odorless gas essential to life that has repeatedly been shown to have little impact on the environment,” Noon said.

Michael McGrady (mmcgrady@uccs.edu) writes from Colorado Springs, Colorado.
Canadian Forest Company Sues Greenpeace in U.S.

Continued from page 1

reserves to mitigate climate change.

Greenpeace has already suffered a legal setback in Canadian courts since it started the RFD public relations campaign. In March 2013, Canadian courts required Greenpeace to apologize to Resolute and offer an official “Notice of Correction” concerning statements it made suggesting Resolute had violated the Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement.

Despite that setback, Greenpeace has continued RFD and has successfully pressured Home Depot and Best Buy to shift orders or stop purchasing lumber from Resolute. Resolute claims it has lost $50 to $100 million in profits over the past four years as a result of Greenpeace’s media campaign. Resolute also says the campaign has forced the company to close one paper mill in Ontario, Canada and two paper-production machines in Quebec, Canada, resulting in the loss of 300 jobs.

Resolute Not Destroying Forests

In an effort to end the RFD campaign and recoup some of its losses, Resolute sued Greenpeace in 2014 in Canada for defamation and “intentional interference with economic relations.” In January 2015, the Ontario Court of Appeal refused to hear Greenpeace’s appeal of a lower court’s judgment rejecting its motion to quash Resolute’s claim. The court also ordered Greenpeace to pay Resolute $20,000 in court costs.

In the Canadian lawsuit, Resolute is suing for $7 million. It is suing for millions of additional dollars in damages and punitive fines in the United States.

Resolute’s complaint states it is not a “destroyer” of the boreal forest in any sense of the word, since Canada has retained about 90 percent of its natural forest cover. Agriculture and urbanization, not forestry in general or Resolute’s timber operations, are responsible for the 10 percent loss in forest cover over the past several hundred years. Resolute says less than 0.5 percent of the Canadian boreal forest is harvested annually by the entire logging industry, and only a minority of the annual harvest is linked to Resolute.

Michael Bowe—an attorney with Kasowitz, Benson, Torres, and Friedman and Resolute’s legal counsel—says every area the company harvests is promptly regenerated naturally, by seeding, or by planting. On average, from 2010 to 2012, Resolute planted more than 60 million trees per year as part of its reforestation efforts. Resolute’s efforts, combined with those of other Canadian forestry companies, has resulted in virtually no permanent loss of boreal forest acreage annually due to logging.

“The accusation that Resolute is ‘destroying’ the boreal forest is absurd,” said Bowe. “It has planted over a billion trees in the boreal forest—a billion more than Greenpeace—and has caused virtually zero permanent deforestation.”

Standing up to ‘Extortion Tactics’

Ecologist Patrick Moore, a co-founder of Greenpeace and leader of Greenpeace Canada for 15 years, no longer agrees with the group he founded on the issue of boreal forest logging.

“I am proud to have worked with Resolute for more than three years on this issue,” said Moore. “They are the only company in North America to stand up to the lies, blackmail, and extortion tactics employed by Greenpeace.”

Contrary to claims made by Greenpeace, Moore says Resolute is not exploiting Canada’s aboriginal people.

“Resolute has the support of the local communities and the aboriginal people in the northern forests, where they are growing trees sustainably and providing essential employment for local citizens.”

“Greenpeace has placed fundraising ahead of the truth, and they should be made to pay for the damage they have done,” Moore said.

H. Sterling Burnett, Ph.D. (@heartland.org) is a research fellow with The Heartland Institute.

Children’s Climate Book Sticks to the Facts

A new climate-change-themed e-book suitable for children ages 8–14 takes the acrimony out of the debate over the causes of climate change by sticking to the facts and available science. The book, titled Kids Guide to Climate Change, makes no theoretical predictions about the future, providing kids with a balanced understanding of this important issue.

The author first explains in easy-to-understand language the difference between climate and weather, then takes the reader through an examination of how seasons, altitude, continents, ocean currents and wind, volcanic action, greenhouse gases, and various climate cycles—such as ice ages, solar activity, El Niño, and La Niña—shape the climates in which people live. The book also explores extreme weather zones and periodic events, such as tropical storms and droughts.

The Kids Guide to Climate Change, part of the Mother Owl series of books, is available on Amazon.com for $3.99: https://www.amazon.com/Kids-Guide-Climate-Change-E-books-ebook/dp/B01F4UF7VC#reader_B01F4UF7VC.
A proposal by Gov. Tom Wolf (D) to begin taxing natural gas production in Pennsylvania would make the state’s energy tax burden the largest in the nation, according to a state financial expert’s testimony to state lawmakers.

In May, Matthew Knittel, director of the Pennsylvania Independent Fiscal Office (IFO), testified before Pennsylvania state legislators to explain the nonpartisan government agency’s economic analysis of Wolf’s proposal, which is included in a recent budget bill. If passed, the legislation would replace the state’s current impact fee with a 5 percent severance tax added to the value of gas extracted and would add 4.7 cents to the cost of each 1,000 cubic feet of gas extracted.

According to IFO’s calculations, if Wolf’s proposal is approved by lawmakers, the state would effectively be charging a severance tax rate of 8.5 percent, making Pennsylvania the most expensive state from which to extract natural gas in the nation.

**No ‘Straight-Up Severance Tax’**
Isaac Orr, a research fellow with The Heartland Institute, which publishes *Environment & Climate News*, says Pennsylvania currently enjoys an advantage over other mineral-producing states.

“Pennsylvania is actually the only major oil-producing state without a straight-up severance tax,” Orr said. “They have what’s known as an impact fee, so they assess a fee for every well drilled. That’s usually a flat fee, so they’re different in that regard. The impact fee concentrates the revenue, which goes to county governments rather than to the state’s coffers.”

Orr says Wolf’s proposal could drive job creation to other states in the region, such as Ohio.

“If all things are equal as far as the cost of drilling, companies might decide to concentrate on drilling in Ohio instead, if the severance tax is higher in Pennsylvania,” Orr said.

**‘Highest’ Tax in the Country**
Bob Dick, a policy analyst with the Commonwealth Foundation, says the plan would be “devastating.”

“Gov. Wolf’s proposal, if it were to be enacted by the legislature, would be the highest effective severance tax in the country,” Dick said. “That would be devastating to the natural gas industry and all the people who depend on it to put food on the table.”

Dick says energy companies will leave Pennsylvania for friendlier states with natural resources, or cut back on production.

“The companies drilling in Pennsylvania could pick up and move to other places that have a lower tax burden and encourage drilling,” Dick said. “If it’s not profitable to do it in Pennsylvania, then they’re not going to do it, it’s that simple.”

**Impact on Families**
Dick says filling the state government’s coffers using energy taxes will come at the expense of everyday people and their families.

“We’re not just talking about wealthy natural gas drillers; we’re talking about people who have families to sustain with their jobs,” Dick said. “They’re going to lose those jobs if the governor’s tax increase becomes law.”

*Jesse Hathaway (jhathaway@heartland.org) is managing editor of Budget & Tax News. An earlier version of this story appeared in Budget & Tax News. Reprinted with permission.*

---

**Pa. Proposes Biggest Energy Tax Hike in the Nation**

**Want the latest info on energy and climate change science and policy?**

Download the new *Fueling Freedom Project* app for free and get the latest information on:

- News, opinion, and videos about the intersection of energy policy and climate science
- Events on climate and energy policy with livestreams and archived video
- Monthly global tropospheric satellite measurements

The FREE Fueling Freedom app is available for iPhone and Android.

www.FuelingFreedomProject.com
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**Tom Wolf**
Governor - PA
Study Shows the High Economic Costs of Renewable Energy

By Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D.

U.S. politicians intent on mandating and subsidizing the use of renewable energy should first consider the damage such policies have done in Europe, concludes an analysis by the Manhattan Institute.

According to the report—titled “What Happens to an Economy When Forced to Use Renewable Energy?”—an assortment of policies enacted by European countries to combat climate change led to soaring electricity costs for residential and commercial customers, leading the authors to recommend the United States reject similar policies.

“During 2008–14, [European Union] member countries spent some $106 billion on energy subsidies. Three countries—Germany ($27.2 billion), Spain ($11.1 billion), and the U.K. ($14.3 billion)—accounted for nearly half that sum,” wrote the report’s authors.

“Those three countries have also seen the largest increases in residential electricity rates,” said the report, which also says, according to Eurostat, “during 2005–14, residential rates in the [European Union] increased by 63 percent, on average. In Germany, those rates increased by 78 percent; in Spain, they increased by 111 percent; and in the U.K., they rose by 133 percent. By comparison, over the same period, residential rates in the U.S. rose by 32 percent.”

“Story Needs Telling”

Germany has been particularly hard hit, the report’s authors say.

“In 2016 alone, German residential customers will pay $29 billion in renewable-energy surcharges for electricity that, on the electricity market, is worth only about $4 billion.”

Germany’s 40.2 million households will pay an average of $721 this year for renewable-energy surcharges. Throughout the European Union, industrial rates have also skyrocketed, increasing by 46 percent from 2005 through 2014—an amount twice as large as the increase in industrial electricity rates in the United States during the same period.

“This is a story that needs to be told,” said Marita Noon, executive director of Energy Makes America Great. “There is a perception among renewable-energy supporters, including Hillary Clinton, that Europe has it all figured out.”

“At Sen. Harry Reid’s 2014 Clean Energy Summit, Clinton bragged, ‘One day last summer, Germany got 74 percent of its energy from renewables,’” Noon said. “However, she didn’t mention that months earlier, in the January cold, renewables supplied only 0.1 percent of the required electricity.

“Facing an election that will determine which energy path America will follow, people need to understand the consequences of mandating renewable energy,” said Noon.

Facing ‘Deindustrialization’

Sobered by what had happened in his country, Sigmar Gabriel, Germany’s energy minister, declared in January 2014 Germany had reached “its limit” in renewable-energy subsidies and had to reduce its electricity prices or face “deindustrialization,” according to the Manhattan Institute report.

For tens of thousands of German workers, deindustrialization has already begun with Germany’s two largest utilities, RWE and E.On, which have laid off a combined 32,000 people since 2011.

The United Kingdom is also reeling from higher energy prices. In March 2016, Tata Steelworks, citing higher energy costs, announced it was selling its facilities in Britain, putting as many as 15,000 jobs at risk.

“British steelmakers and other large users of electricity paid nearly twice as much for electricity as the EU average,” said the authors in the Manhattan Institute report.

Spain, once cited by President Barack Obama as a model to follow for green energy use, has ended its renewable-energy subsidies, halting expansion of the country’s wind and solar installations after “the country’s electric utilities have accumulated a $32 billion deficit that must now be repaid … by adding surcharges of about 55 percent to customers’ bills,” the report points out.

Robert Bryce, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and the report’s author, says Europe’s experience with green energy should be a clear warning for policymakers in the United States.

“To avoid the kinds of results seen in Europe, U.S. policymakers at the federal and state levels should be required to do rigorous cost-benefit analyses before imposing renewable-energy mandates,” Bryce said. “U.S. policymakers must also consider the impact higher energy costs will have on overall employment and industrial competitiveness.”

“Some people think wind and solar are inexpensive, because wind and sunshine are free,” said Dan Simmons, vice president for policy at the Institute for Energy Research. “The problem is the wind doesn’t always blow and the sun doesn’t always shine, and yet people want reliable energy 24 hours per day, seven days a week, and 365 days a year. As the Europeans have discovered, and we should take notice, keeping the lights on and dealing with unreliable sources of electricity like wind and solar is very expensive.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research.

INTERNET INFO

Portland School Board Bans Materials Questioning Human-Caused Climate Change

By Bonner R. Cohen

The Public School Board in Portland, Oregon unanimously approved a resolution banning textbooks and other teaching materials expressing any doubt or reservations concerning the claim humans are the primary cause of global climate change and its alleged dangerous consequences.

The May 17 decision was supported by environmental groups that claim the debate over the theory humans’ fossil-fuel use is currently causing dangerous climate change is over and the science is settled.

The resolution—introduced by Mike Rosen, a member of the Portland Public School Board—also instructs the superintendent and staff to develop a plan for offering “curriculum and educational opportunities that address climate change and climate justice” in all of Portland’s public schools, the Portland Tribune reported.

Responding to the resolution, physicist James Wanliss of Presbyterian College said, “I’m appalled by the school board’s action.

“The decision to hide the fact there is still an active ongoing debate concerning the causes and consequences of current climate change will only contribute to scientific illiteracy among Portland’s students,” said Wanliss.

Environmental Groups Drive Resolution

Bill Bigelow—editor of Rethinking Schools, an online magazine, and co-author of A People’s Curriculum on the Earth—acknowledged that he had worked with several out-of-state environmentalist groups on the resolution, the Portland Tribune reported.

“A lot of text materials are thick with the language of doubt, and, obviously, the science says otherwise,” Bigelow told the Tribune. “We don’t want kids in Portland learning material courtesy of the fossil-fuel industry.”

Bigelow was particularly disturbed that textbooks addressing climate change frequently use words such as “might,” “may,” and “could.” As an example of the kind of language he would like to see removed from the classroom, Bigelow cited a passage in a physical science textbook published by Pearson, which read: “Carbon dioxide emissions from motor vehicles, power plants, [and] other sources may contribute to global warming.”

Conflicts of Interest?

Critics of the ban have questioned whether Bigelow has a conflict of interest in the textbook debate—since he has a textbook that could be used to replace existing materials—but Bigelow denies this and says it wouldn’t be necessary to buy “new stuff.”

Similarly, Rosen, who introduced the resolution, is involved in an environmental education project called the NW Ecilitersity Collaboration, which could eventually provide educational materials to teachers under the new curriculum guidelines. Rosen, who works part-time for the Portland Audubon Society, informed the Tribune he put his work with NW Ecilitersity Collaboration “on hold” to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

“The Portland school board is replacing education with indoctrination,” said Craig Rucker, executive director of the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow.

Oregon Lawmakers Sued Over Gray Wolf Decision

By Mary C. Tillotson

Cascadia Wildlands, an environmental group in Oregon, has filed a complaint with the Oregon Government Ethics Commission alleging three Oregon state lawmakers committed ethics violations.

Cascadia says the lawmakers’ attempt to pass a bill limiting legal action to prevent gray wolf populations in the state from being removed from the state’s Endangered Species List qualifies as unethical behavior.

Citing evidence showing gray wolf populations in the state have been growing and safe from decline, Oregon’s Fish and Wildlife Commission (OFWC) decided to remove the gray wolf from the state’s Endangered Species List in 2015. OFWC reported the wolf population had grown by 36 percent in 2015 alone.

OFWC’s decision was challenged by Cascadia Wildlands, which, according to court filings, said it was “premature and scientifically flawed.”

State lawmakers passed House Bill 4040 in March 2016 confirming OFWC’s decision. Citing the new law, the Oregon Court of Appeals threw out Cascadia’s lawsuit in April.

Cascadia responded by filing an ethics complaint against Oregon state Reps. Sal Esquivel (R-Medford), Greg Barreto (R-Cove), and Brad Witt (D-Clatskanie). The complaint alleges the lawmakers made “numerous false statements and misrepresentations” in order to help HB 4040 pass.

Esquivel is not concerned about the ethics complaint.

“Esquivel is not concerned about the ethics complaint,” Esquivel said.

Why the Complaint?

“Why the Complaint? “The reason [for the ethics complaint], I think, is to recruit people and to send a message to their allies in the Democratic Party and the State of Oregon that says, ‘This is what we’re going to do to you if you cross us.’” Esquivel said. “Nowhere in the bill does it prohibit anyone from filing a lawsuit. It doesn’t do that, and they know it.

“It’ll be dismissed. I’m not even concerned about it,” said Esquivel. “It concerns me how they utilize this to smear three of us, a Democrat and two Republicans, and use this as their recruiting poster, in my opinion.”

Gray wolves have not caused significant problems in Esquivel’s mostly urban district, but farmers raising livestock in rural areas of the state have had problems.

“You can’t go out and just shoot a wolf. That’s against the law,” said Esquivel. “[Delisting] allows farmer John out there to shoot a wolf just like he can shoot a dog that is chasing his livestock.”

Mary C. Tillotson (mary.c.tillotson@gmail.com) is a freelance writer from Michigan.
"We must all hang together, or most assuredly we will all hang separately."
—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Our primary energy suppliers—coal, oil, natural gas, nuclear and hydro—must band together to fight environmental extremism that threatens them all.

OTHERWISE, AMERICANS WILL BE LEFT FREEZING IN THE DARK, AS COSTS SOAR AND MILLIONS OF JOBS ARE LOST—ALL FOR NO ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT!

The Clean Power Plan is the latest dangerous, activist-driven energy policy. It targets coal, our cheapest and most plentiful electricity source. Rather than taking advantage of coal’s demise, energy providers and elected officials must explain how each energy source has its role to play in ensuring America’s prosperity.
Federal Judge Rebukes White House, Cites ‘Bad Faith’ over FOIA Request

By Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D.

Judge Amit Mehta of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled on May 9 the Obama administration had engaged in “bad faith” in its handling of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request made by the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI).

CEI made its FOIA request to investigate assertions made by the White House about human-caused global warming.

Mehta’s ruling is a victory for CEI, which has long challenged the Obama administration’s claims about man-made global warming. CEI used FOIA to seek data used to support a statement made by John Holdren, director of the Office of Science and Technology (OST), claiming global warming would cause extremely cold winters to happen with greater regularity. Holdren’s comments were made public in a video posted on the White House’s website.

Data Denied
CEI’s FOIA request was met with stiff resistance and shifting explanations by the Obama administration.

Staffers at OST initially claimed they could find only 11 pages of documents, none containing data supporting Holdren’s assertion. That figure was later raised to 47 pages, but the White House attempted to withhold them, claiming they were protected from release because they were for internal use only. OST officials then acknowledged the existence of 52 additional pages of drafts they had withheld, but they claimed the documents were similar to what OST had already produced. Finally, OST staffers said they had found 10 more draft documents, bringing to 112 the total number of pages uncovered related to Holdren’s claims concerning winters.

‘Inconsistent Representations’
In his ruling, Mehta said CEI’s “truth-seeking” FOIA requests should be honored.

“At some point, the government’s inconsistent representations about the scope and completeness of its searches must give way to the truth-seeking function of the adversarial process, including the tools available through discovery. This case has crossed that threshold.”

CEI General Counsel Sam Kazman told Newsmax after the ruling, “As the government’s course of action here demonstrates, there’s a clear pattern when it comes to this administration: In dealing with global warming issues, agencies tend to act illegally.”

By taking the unusual step of allowing discovery, Mehta empowered CEI to obtain the documents it has sought for months. Discovery allows greater access than FOIA and is less dependent on the cooperation of those from whom documents are being requested. Traditionally, courts have given the government the benefit of the doubt when carrying out searches for requested documents under FOIA. Mehta determined the government’s actions in this case undermined the normal case for deference.

As The Washington Times noted, this is the third time within the past year a judge has scolded the Obama administration for failure to comply with document requests. The other two cases involved the State Department’s foot-dragging in response to requests for documents related to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s private e-mail server.

“Judge Mehta is [not] the first, nor will he be the last, judge to say he’s had enough with the executive branch’s refusal to execute the law—in this case the Freedom of Information Act,” said David W. Schnare, general counsel for the Energy & Environment Legal Institute. “An angry electorate is fed up with this kind of Washington, DC, hide-the-ball government, and that is why we and CEI have had to go to the courts to bring big government back to the people.”

Craig Rucker, executive director of the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow, also blasted the Obama administration’s record on transparency.

“The disrespect this administration has for the rule of law is matched by its contempt for taxpayers with whose money these games are played,” said Rucker. “They crow about transparency but use public institutions, including the already overburdened court system, to pull the wool over the public’s eyes.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research.
Innovations and Safety in Hydraulic Fracturing

By Jay Lehr, Ph.D.

The copious amounts of oil and gas produced over the past decade through the combination of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling has resulted in greater energy security for the United States and extremely low oil and natural gas prices for consumers. Contrary to radical anti-fossil-fuel activists’ claims, this energy bounty has come with little or no harm to the environment.

Hydraulic fracturing has been used by extractors to increase yield since 1947, although it’s only recently the technique, also called “fracking,” has greatly impacted the energy industry.

In the late 1990s, Mitchell Energy figured out how to turn a well shaft from vertical to horizontal, enabling it to pierce thousands of feet of porous, but not very permeable, shale that harbors pockets of gas and oil. Using the very same hydraulic fracturing techniques employed for 50 years, Mitchell Energy—and soon after, many of Mitchell’s competitors—was able to access these previously unavailable petroleum resources for the first time.

No Contamination

The public has been misled by anti-fossil-fuel alarmists to believe fracking wells are drilled in or near the water table or underground water wells. Alarmists have convinced many people their water is at risk whenever fracking occurs. Nothing could be further from the truth. Because of the limits of technology, shale gas wells must be drilled thousands of feet below subsurface water supplies.

The lack of understanding is a result of several factors, including the use of poor explanations and terribly scaled drilling diagrams. For instance, it is likely some of those reading this article believe, as most diagrams show, that at some point in the fracking process the drill bit turns at a right angle or gently curves, requiring only a few hundred vertical feet. This is not true.

The primary technological advancement that has made horizontal drilling possible is the creation of a drill bit that can be turned by a separate motor that controls rotation. The bit is on a swivel directed by a global positioning system. The drill pipe is essentially the same inflexible steel pipe that has been in use for a century, except now it is able to bend approximately 3 degrees from vertical for every 100 feet of pipe.

Simple arithmetic shows to turn a pipe 90 degrees from a vertical orientation to a horizontal orientation requires, at a minimum, 30 lengths of pipe measuring 100 feet each, for a total of 3,000 vertical feet—a much greater distance than many commonly used diagrams and explanations suggest. Because a significant amount of production comes from even deeper sources, there are often thousands of feet of rock separating the production zone and water wells.

Contrary to the claims made by many fracking alarmists, the thousands of feet between water wells and the fracking production zone help to make the practice safe, when conducted properly. More than one million wells have been hydraulically fractured to date, and there has not been a single water well proven to have been contaminated by either fracking fluids or oil and gas seepage.

Dangerous Chemicals?

Those opposed to fracking often say chemicals used in the process are dangerous and that hydraulic fracturing should be banned to prevent the chemicals from reaching water supplies. This claim is not supported by scientific evidence.

It is true certain chemicals are added to the water used as part of the fracking process to reduce surface tension in liquids, prevent corrosion in the well, and eliminate bacteria, among other purposes, but the chemicals make up less than 0.5 percent of the total volume of fluid pumped into wells. These same chemicals are safely used in common household products such as dish detergents, deodorants, furniture polish, and paint.

Many drilling companies have in the past refused to say which chemicals they used in order to protect important trade secrets. Radical environmentalists took advantage of the situation and convinced many in the public to believe the secrecy was linked to the potential danger the chemicals would pose if they reached water wells. Today, most states require drilling companies to disclose the chemicals they use, and there’s no reason to believe any of those chemicals pose a significant threat to humans’ water supplies.

Drillable Formations

Drillable shale formations containing significant quantities of natural gas and oil exist throughout the United States. The most famous and prolific at this time are the Bakken formation in North Dakota, the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania, and the Barnett Shale in Texas.

While the price of oil and gas has declined, yields from horizontal wells have increased 300 percent in the past five years—largely because technology has improved with experience.

Environmentalists can’t produce a single person who has been harmed or point to an ecosystem ravaged as a result of fracting. Fracking has produced tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, lowered energy costs, has helped to bring manufacturing back to America, and has reduced our dependence on foreign oil.

Every time you fill up your car at the pump or pay your electric bill, thank a fracker for the low prices you are paying.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (jlehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute. To learn more about this topic, read the Renewable Energy and Shale Gas Encyclopedia, published by Wiley in 2016.
By Kenneth Artz

The Group of Seven (G-7), an informal bloc of industrialized democratic countries, announced it plans to promote investments in oil and gas projects to ensure the availability of a steady stream of supply.

The G-7—Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States—made the announcement at the end of its May 2016 ministerial energy meeting, held in Kitakyushu City, Japan. The G-7 meet annually to discuss issues such as global economic governance, international security, and energy policy.

According to a statement from the Japanese government, the nations will encourage financial institutions to invest in energy projects, even though investments in oil and gas production are expected to fall 18 percent in 2016, after dropping 24 percent in 2015.

As part of the agreement, ministers say they will support changes to the liquefied natural gas industry, including allowing long-term contracts with looser destination restrictions, and they say they will promote the development of natural gas infrastructure, such as pipelines and storage tanks.

Reliable Energy Needed

David Rothbard, president of the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow, says the G-7 announcement shows its member governments recognize reliable sources of energy are needed to run an economy.

“Nations that tend to go heavy on renewables put their manufacturing base at risk,” Rothbard said. “Renewables are unreliable, intermittent, and very expensive.”

Limited Benefits

Rothbard says electricity prices in Europe—notably in places such as Denmark and Germany, where they rely more on renewables—are very high, resulting in factories now moving to China and developing countries.

“Data continue to accumulate showing limited, if any, benefits flow from using energy created by renewables,” Rothbard said. “If you have a lot of heavy industry and a large fleet of electric cars, the power grid is put at risk if you are a country using a lot of renewables.”

Infrastructure is also important for fracking and natural gas extraction, Rothbard said.

“You have to have pipelines and delivery [and] other means to get the energy to where it needs to be, so support from the G-7 nations is very important,” said Rothbard.

Dan Kish, a senior vice president for policy at the Institute for Energy, says renewable energy sources are not reliable.

“If we want on-demand power 24 hours a day, seven days a week when you flip a switch, then we have to have plentiful, reliable energy sources, and renewables aren’t it,” Kish said.

Renewables Are ‘Creatures of Government’

“Wind and solar projects are creatures of government and wouldn’t exist without it,” Kish said.

“In many cases, governments are big talkers when it comes to renewables,” Kish said. “But occasionally everyone sobers up, like what they did at this G-7 meeting, and [they] have a serious discussion about energy.

“Government shouldn’t do anything to discourage investment,” Kish said. “This sends a message to the people in those areas their investments will be safe.

“For instance, a deep-water drilling platform costs up to $3 billion or more, and they are expected to last 20 years, so before you invest that kind of money, you want to know government won’t act to undermine your investment,” Kish said.

Kenneth Artz (kartz@heartland.org) writes from Dallas, Texas.
By Ron Arnold

A t a press conference held on March 29, 2016, a coalition of 16 Democratic state attorneys general, the attorney general for the U.S. Virgin Islands, and former Vice President Al Gore, announced a collective effort to force climate skeptics to their knees by suing them into silence.

The AGs, who are referring to themselves as AGs United for Clean Power, declared they would “creatively and aggressively” use their powers to force ExxonMobil, think tanks, and individuals to recognize there is no debate over whether humans are causing dangerous climate change, and to accept the green-energy schemes pushed by the Obama administration to end fossil fuel use.

Shawn McCoy, publisher of Inside Sources, questioned the AGs’ motives, writing, “A Bloomberg Review editorial noted that the Exxon investigation is preposterous and a dangerous affirmation of power. The New York Times has pointed out that Exxon has published research that lines up with mainstream climatology and therefore there’s not a comparison to Big Tobacco. So is the investigation a publicity stunt?”

Evidence shows Claude Walker, the attorney general of the Virgin Islands, New York State Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, and the other AGs had been colluding with environmental groups for more than a month before the press conference.

On March 15, two weeks before the press conference, Walker sent a subpoena alleging “conspiracy to obtain money by false pretenses” to ExxonMobil’s headquarters in Dallas, Texas. He failed to mention that subpoena during the press conference in New York City. He had something to hide, and he hid it.

Private Attorney, Public Power

When ExxonMobil received Walker’s subpoena, the return address was not the Department of Justice in the Virgin Islands; it was the Washington, DC office of Linda Singer. Walker had delegated his territorial powers to her as his “national counsel” to manage the investigation.

Singer is the perfect lawyer to perform a predatory investigation. She’s a former attorney general of the District of Columbia and a partner in Cohen, Milstein, Sellers and Toll PLLC, which touts itself as “the most effective law firm in the United States for lawsuits with a strong social and political component.”

Singer also has experience using questionable tactics to win lucrative, highly publicized cases, according to a 2014 article in The New York Times titled “Lawyers Create Big Paydays by Coaxing Attorneys General to Sue.” Singer was selected as the Times’ opening profile in its report, which describes how she approached New Mexico Attorney General Gary King with an “unusual proposition.” Singer wanted him “to sue the owner of a nursing home in rural New Mexico that Mr. King had never heard of and Ms. Singer had never set foot in.”

Her proposed lawsuit did not cite any specific complaints about care, only numbers on staffing levels suggesting residents were being mistreated. The New York Times highlighted “the enormous potential payoff for Ms. Singer’s firm if she could persuade Mr. King to hire her and use his state powers to investigate and sue, which he did.”

The payoff in a climate suit against Exxon and others would be even bigger, and as the Times explained, this legal racket is a thriving industry: “Plaintiffs’ lawyers working on a contingency-fee basis have teamed up mostly with Democratic state attorneys general to file hundreds of lawsuits against businesses that make anything from pharmaceuticals to snack foods.”

Defendants Fight Back

ExxonMobil responded to this political lawsuit by suing Walker, Singer, and Singer’s law firm for violating the company’s “constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and due process of law. ...” Other victims of Walker’s abuse of process have also gone on the attack. On April 7, a subpoena was served to the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) by Walker, in which he demanded CEI produce e-mails, statements, drafts, and other documents regarding its work on climate change and energy policy—including private donor information—from 1997 through 2007.

CEI responded forcefully to the subpoena. CEI General Counsel Sam Kazman issued a strong statement repudiating the tactics: “CEI will vigorously fight to quash this subpoena. It is an affront to our First Amendment rights of free speech and association for Attorney General Walker to bring such intimidating demands against a nonprofit group. If Walker and his allies succeed, the real victims will be all Americans, whose access to affordable energy will be hit by one costly regulation after another, while scientific and policy debates are wiped out one subpoena at a time.”

In mid-May, CEI took out a full-page ad in The New York Times. The ad text read, ‘Abuse of Power: All Americans have the right to support causes they believe in,’ decrying the unjustifiable attacks on climate skeptics by AGs United for Clean Power [shown above at their March 29 press conference].”

Ron Arnold (arnold.ron@gmail.com) is a free-enterprise activist, author, and commentator.
States Supporting Green Energy Have Higher Costs

By Bonner R. Cohen

States promoting renewable energy through subsidies, mandates, and other programs have the highest electricity costs in the nation, according to an analysis by the Daily Caller News Foundation (DCNF).

For example, DCNF’s report shows California and West Virginia sit on the opposite ends of the energy-price spectrum, likely as a result of their energy policies. DCNF data show California had among the nation’s highest power prices, paying 14.3 cents per kilowatt hour (Kwh), and has 183 policies supporting green energy. West Virginia had among America’s cheapest power prices—consumers there paid 7.91 cents per Kwh—and only 11 policies supporting green energy.

Statistically Significant Correlation

“Statistical analysis run by DCNF found a positive and statistically significant correlation existed between high electricity bills and states with numerous policies supporting green energy,” DCNF wrote. “States which offered rebates, buy-back programs, tax exemptions, and direct cash subsidies to green energy were 64 percent more likely to have higher than average electric bills. For every additional pro-green policy a state, the average price of electricity rose by about .01 cent per kilo-watt hour.”

Using data from the U.S. Energy Information Administration and the Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency, DCNF found the highest regional prices for power in the lower 48 states were in northeastern states. For instance, Connecticut’s average electric price was 15.7 per Kwh, while New York’s was 15.4 cents per Kwh.

Two Western states, Washington and Wyoming, had America’s cheapest electricity. Consumers there paid on average 7.1 cents per Kwh and 7.66 cents per Kwh, respectively.

DCNF says Washington State residents enjoy relatively inexpensive power despite having numerous renewable-energy policies because of their access to federally developed hydropower. Most states with relatively inexpensive power, such as West Virginia and Wyoming, relied heavily on coal for electric power generation.

High Costs of Subsidies and Mandates

According to DCNF’s analysis, “In general, the nation’s cheapest power was found in states which didn’t financially support green energy.”

The federal government also provides incentives to encourage the use of renewable power. Wind power, for example, is subsidized through the Production Tax Credit, which provides wind developers with a tax credit of 2.3 cents per Kwh for electricity generated to the power grid.

DCNF also writes, “[S]olar power receives a 30 percent tax credit from the federal government, which subsidizes solar power 326 times more than it subsidizes coal, oil, or natural gas.”

Wind, Solar Not Free

“The belief that wind and solar power are free is as widespread as it is false,” said Isaac Orr, a research fellow at The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Power derived from wind and solar is far more expensive than from traditional sources.”

“This study shows regulations and subsidies for inefficient and expensive sources of energy have consequences,” said Dan Simmons, vice president for policy at the Institute for Energy Research. “For years, states such as those in the Northeast and California have imposed regulations, subsidies, and mandates on their respective electricity markets, and, as a result, prices for power are much higher there.

“This is a sad and easily foreseeable consequence of an ill-considered policy,” Simmons said.

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research.

Environmental Common Sense

Re-Thinking Green

AlTERNATIVES TO ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAUCRACY
Edited by Robert Higgs and Carl P. Close

“A complete guide to environmental policy. This book provides a history of erroneous environmental thinking, a devastating critique of current policies and a menu for improvement.”

—Paul H. Rubin, Professor of Economics and Law, Emory University

A Poverty of Reason

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Wilfred Beckerman

“...In A Poverty of Reason, Wilfred Beckerman brings wisdom and wit to his examination of major themes found in today’s environmental policy... Not much for slogans, Beckerman goes far beyond the usual in developing recommendations for environmental policy.”

—Bruce Yandle, Dean Emeritus, College of Business and Behavioral Science, Clemson University

Oxford University economist Wilfred Beckerman puts “sustainable development” to the test in A Poverty of Reason, questioning several of its core claims: Will economic growth burn itself out by depleting the natural resources it requires? Will global warming wreak widespread havoc? Does human activity threaten to throw a delicate planet dangerously “out of balance”? A Poverty of Reason will prove essential in the ongoing debate about environmental and economic practices.
Explaining the Myths and Dangers of Anti-Humanism

By Jay Lehr, Ph.D.

There have been many excellent books recounting how environmental zealots have worsened human welfare and the environment, but few meticulously present the philosophical inner-workings of these radicals.

In his book, *Merchants of Despair: Radical Environmentalists, Criminal Pseudo-Scientists, and the Fatal Cult of Antihumanism*, recently reprinted by The Heartland Institute, author Robert Zubrin presents a must-read explanation for why environmental activists believe in their anti-human agenda.

**Earth’s Cancer**

Zubrin gets right to the heart of the matter by showing readers that many radical environmentalists believe humans are essentially a cancer for Earth, making it impossible for humans to practice good stewardship. After all, cancer cells can never be good stewards of the human body.

Zubrin probes the ideology of anti-humanism, showing some of today’s most fashionable political and social ideas as essentially replays of earlier ideological fads that were used to justify oppression, tyranny, and genocide. Because it has widely been acknowledged that those without a knowledge of history are condemned to repeat it, this book is vitally important.

**A Rogue’s Gallery of Tyranny**

Zubrin says the effort to disect this monster so it can be understood and debunked is long overdue, and he is able to accomplish this feat with this elegantly referenced, scholarly work. He traces the roots of anti-humanism from Thomas Malthus in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to Paul Ehrlich in recent years, and on to Al Gore today.

Malthus argued population growth is a blight on Earth and harms rather than benefits the human condition, but Zubrin brilliantly disproves this philosophy using writers, both present and from the past.

As Zubrin shows, in Henry George’s 1879 book *Progress and Poverty*, George outlines a better view of the human interaction with the environment, writing, “Human beings are not simply the consumers of a preexisting gift of nature; they are also the cultivators of the bounty on which they live.”

The twentieth century economist Julian Simon agreed, observing that as the world’s population has increased, the standard of living has also risen at an accelerating rate, facts Zubrin illustrates graphically.

On the other hand, Malthusians Ehrlich and President Barack Obama’s science advisor John Holdren jointly said in 1971 mankind was, in Zubrin’s words, “so many bacteria in a culture dish, doomed to quick extinction unless our appetites can be controlled by wise overlords yielding sterilants to curb our excessive multiplication.”

Their predictions of a catastrophic collapse in the human condition by the turn of the twenty-first century proved to be the exact opposite of what occurred.

**Path to Genocide**

Zubrin’s brief chapter on Charles Darwin will be very enlightening for many readers of this book. Most people today recognize Darwin’s contribution to the understanding of evolution of species, but many are unfamiliar with his dangerously wrong theory that societies advance entirely based on genetics. The theories presented in his deeply flawed book *The Descent of Man* have become a source of much anti-humanism since its publication.

Darwin’s cousin, Sir Francis Galton, expanded upon Darwin’s bad ideas by developing the terrible theory of eugenics. According to Zubrin, manipulation of the gene pool, often through harsh and barbaric methods, benefits humans “breeding” and ultimately human evolution. Such a theory casts leaders who attempt to breed “master races” as moral heroes rather than genocidal villains.

The story of eugenics in the United States through much of the twentieth century will astound you. Zubrin shows how both Nazism and environmentalism sprang from the same seeds and were based in great part on a commitment to eugenics.

**Population Control Debunked**

More than any writer before him, Zubrin clarifies the impetus behind virtually every wrongheaded population-control idea and anti-ethnic activity this nation has ever undergone. This includes the suppression of DDT, a campaign that received significant support despite the fact DDT had successfully wiped out malaria.

As enlightening as any segment of the book is Zubrin’s discussion of population control. Trends indicate Earth’s population will likely stop growing shortly after the year 2060. Yet anti-humanists continue to push for population-control measures, arguing we cannot afford to allow more humans to live on the planet.

Zubrin says China’s one-child-per-family requirement serves as a lurid example of the nauseating lengths to which population-control advocates will go. Shamefully, mainstream environmental activists who claim to be liberal thinkers frequently praise China’s population-control policies.

A more modern campaign to reduce population comes from the environmental organizations that make every effort to eliminate the use of genetically modified grains, which offer the world abundant, safe, and healthy food. This situation is well-documented by Hassen Adamu, the Nigerian minister of agriculture.

“To deny desperate, hungry people the means to control their futures by presuming to know what is best for them is ... paternalistic and morally wrong,” said Adamu. “We want to have the opportunity to save the lives of millions of people. ... The harsh reality is that without the help of agricultural biotechnology many will not live.”

I believe no one has so clearly explained the threat of the anti-human movement throughout history as Zubrin has done in *Merchants of Despair*. To read this book is to become a warrior on the side of humanity.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (jlehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute.

“More than any writer before him, Zubrin clarifies the impetus behind virtually every wrongheaded population-control idea and anti-ethnic activity this nation has ever undergone.”
Freedom Rising

The Heartland Institute is a national nonprofit research and education organization devoted to changing the world with ideas.

We play an essential role in the movement for limited government and personal liberty. Heartland is the pipeline between the freedom movement’s leading writers and thinkers and the nation’s 8,500 national and state elected officials.

Heartland is 6,000 advocates for more freedom and less government. We produce original research, apply the freedom philosophy to real-world problems, and inspire the next generation of freedom fighters.

You may know us from our work exposing inaccurate science and missing economics behind the global warming delusion. Heartland is also a leader in advancing school choice, opposing implementation of Obamacare, and calling for limits on taxes and spending.

We need your support to continue making the world a better place. If you are not already a donor, please sign up today. Visit giving.heartland.org.
GLOBAL SATELLITE TEMPERATURES

HOW MUCH GLOBAL WARMING?

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.

MAY 2016

GLOBAL AVERAGE

The global average temperature for May was 0.55°C above average.

NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

The Northern Hemisphere’s temperature was 0.65°C above average.

SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE

The Southern Hemisphere’s temperature was 0.44°C above average.

GLOBAL SATELLITE TEMPERATURES

219,000 years of Temperature Variation