Temperatures Rising Only Half as Much as Reported

By James M. Taylor

A reanalysis of U.S. surface temperature station data shows temperatures are rising only half as much as claimed by the U.S. Historical Climatology Network and others in the government responsible for maintaining temperature data.

The reanalysis is the first using the Siting Classification System devised by the MATEO-France French national meteorological service and recently approved by the World Meteorological Organization.

The new analysis, conducted by a team of scientists led by surface station expert Anthony Watts, shows government data gatekeepers are improperly reporting double the temperature increase that is occurring in the real world. Fully 92 percent of the overstated temperature rise results from erroneous and scientifically unjustified “adjustments” to the raw temperature data. Global temperatures are rising more...
Minority Believe in Manmade Global Warming Crisis

By Cheryl K. Chumley

Fewer than half of Americans believe global warming is occurring and is primarily caused by humans, a newly published Angus Reid public opinion poll reports.

Merely 42 percent of Americans and 43 percent of Britons believe global warming is occurring and is primarily caused by humans, according to the three-nation poll. Canadians are more willing to buy into climate alarmists’ assertions, with 58 percent saying global warming is occurring and is primarily caused by humans.

Alarmists Harmed by Climategate

According to the survey results, support for global warming alarmism fell dramatically when the public learned about prominent alarmist scientists hiding, doctoring, and destroying data and bullying editors of peer-reviewed journals not to publish studies casting doubt on global warming alarmism.

“We saw a big drop in belief in emissions-caused climate change immediately after the so-called Climategate controversy,” said Mario Canseco, vice president of Angus Reid. “Many people in the United Kingdom were disappointed with the revelation, and the numbers have dropped as a result.”

Differences Among Nations, Regions

The survey revealed regional differences within individual nations, as well as differences between different nations.

In Quebec, 71 percent of respondents believe global warming is occurring and is primarily caused by human activities. Only 41 percent of respondents in Alberta thought similarly.

In the United Kingdom, 48 percent of Londoners believe humans are primarily responsible for ongoing global warming, compared to 41 percent of those living in Midlands and Wales.

In the United States, the highest percentage of people believing in primarily manmade global warming are in the West, where 48 percent believe global warming is occurring and humans are primarily responsible. Only 39 percent of Midwesterners agree with that, the survey reports.

Economic Concerns Important

Canseco said economic concerns weighed heavily in the survey results.

“The other issue that is definitely playing a role in perceptions is the battle between economic growth and environmental protection,” Canseco said. “In Canada, the government has been criticized by the opposition for not taking action on specific environmental concerns. In Britain and the United States, people are more worried about creating jobs, and there’s a tendency from a large component of the population, one in five, to look at climate change as a theory that actually hampers growth.”

The survey found only 45 percent of Americans favor protecting the environment at the risk of hampering economic growth.

Cheryl Chumley (ckchumley@aol.com) is a digital editor with the Washington Times’ latest endeavor, www.Times247.com.

NC Legislature Overrides Veto, Legalizes Fracking for Gas

Continued from page 1

find a single instance of groundwater pollution.

Carney spent months voicing opposition to the fracking bill, only to become the final, decisive vote to override Perdue’s veto. Carney asked for a suspension of legislative rules so she could vote again, but House leadership denied her request for a do-over.

“Gov. Perdue did the right thing by vetoing the rush to frack,” said Elizabeth Ouzts, state director of Environment North Carolina. “She stood up for our water and our air. It’s bad enough that the General Assembly overrode her veto. It’s even worse that they did so based on an accidental vote.”

Not Much Changed

Environmental provisions in the legislation delay North Carolina fracking by at least a couple years.

“This just opens the door to fracking a little bit wider,” said Becki Gray, vice president for outreach at the North Carolina-based John Locke Foundation. “Nothing can be done for two years at least. [Any fracking request] also has to come back to the legislature for approval. This just allows the process to go on to the next level.”

Governor’s Shifting Positions

So far, the process has been “very interesting,” according to Gray. Months ago, Perdue had taken a public stance in favor of fracking, only to be swayed seemingly at the last minute to veto the bill. In May she had issued an executive order detailing her support for fracking, so long as it upheld environmental and health standards and didn’t pose a threat to public safety.

On the day of her veto, however, Perdue said, “I support energy policies that create jobs and lower costs for businesses and families. Our drinking water and the health and safety of North Carolina’s families are too important. We can’t put them in jeopardy by rushing to allow fracking without proper safeguards.”

Republican lawmakers called Perdue a flip-flopper and expressed surprise at the veto. They pointed out they had compromised in drafting the legislation to include the governor’s recommendations on clean energy alternatives.

Gray said pressure from environmental activist groups and other special interests likely forced Perdue to rescind her support and exercise the veto.

“As this bill continued to develop through the General Assembly, we had anticipated that—given the governor’s statements—it would not be vetoed. Yet she did. And the pressure obviously came from the environmental community,” Gray said.

Cheryl Chumley (ckchumley@aol.com) is a digital editor with the Washington Times’ newest endeavor, www.Times247.com.
Monckton Exposes Bias, Flaws in Skeptic Magazine Warming Article

By James M. Taylor

Readers of Skeptic magazine should exercise skepticism themselves regarding the magazine’s biased and flawed reporting on global warming, a well-known global warming expert observes in a paper published by the Science and Public Policy Institute.

“Be skeptical, be very skeptical,” Lord Christopher Monckton, viscount of Brenchley, advises in “Be Skeptical of Skeptics’ Skepticism of Skeptics.”

Critiquing Skeptic’s recent front-page article, “Climate Change Q&A: Climate Deniers’ Arguments & Climate Scientists’ Answers,” Monckton writes, “Anyone who starts out by using the hate-speech term ‘Climate Deniers’—laden with political overtones of Holocaust denial—cannot expect to be taken seriously as an objective scientist.”

Monckton documents dozens of flaws and misrepresentations in the Skeptic article, pointing out the article misrepresents the fundamental issues in the global warming debate.

Writes Monckton, “It is at once clear that the author is approaching the question from a political and not a scientific standpoint, for he is carefully failing to ask the right questions. A genuine ‘seeker after truth’ (al-Haytham’s beautiful phrase for the scientist) would surely have started by asking and attempting to answer the three pertinent questions that are at the core of the skeptical case he is attacking.”

Instead, the Skeptic article presents an inaccurate and easily attacked straw man purporting to represent global warming skeptics.

Monckton also shows how the article improperly relies on flawed alarmist computer models that consistently predict more warming than has occurred in the real world.

Even if the alarmists’ speculative predictions of rapid temperature increase had come true, this still would not justify the “solutions” they offer, Monckton notes, writing, “It would be a whole lot cheaper to adapt later than to abate now.”
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rapidly over land than over the oceans. The new analysis shows U.S. temperatures rose only 0.155 degrees Celsius per decade from 1979 through 2008 according to high-quality surface temperature stations. The 0.155 degree increase is substantially less than is claimed by government officials, and it is sufficiently moderate to rebut fears of an imminent global warming crisis.

The authors note global temperature trends are unlikely to be substantially different from those reported in their new analysis.

Lead author Anthony Watts explained how government gatekeepers overlook meaningful siting problems that add fictitious warming to the raw data.

“The USHCN is one of the main temperature records used to gauge the temperature changes in the United States,” wrote Watts in a press release announcing the findings. “The first wide-scale effort to address siting issues, Watts (2009), a collated photographic survey, showed that approximately 90% of USHCN stations were compromised by encroachment of urbanity in the form of heat sinks and sources, such as concrete, asphalt, air conditioning system heat exchangers, roadways, airport tarmac, and other issues. This finding was backed up by an August 2011 U.S. [Government Accountability] Office investigation and report titled: Climate Monitoring: NOAA Can Improve Management of the U.S. Historical Climatology Network.”

The authors also explain how improper manipulation of the raw temperature data manufactures fictitious warming. According to the authors:

• Statistically significant differences exist between well-sited temperature stations and stations whose temperature data are influenced by encroaching urbanization, poor siting locations, and changes in nearby surface conditions that affect temperature readings.

• Gatekeepers who maintain the raw data improperly adjust temperatures from poorly sited stations upward, and then add similar nonexistent warming to temperature data from well-sited stations.

• After the temperature readings from well-sited stations are improperly adjusted, there appears to be three times as much warming from those stations as the raw data indicate.

• Urban temperature stations report more warming than semi-urban stations, which in turn report more warming than rural stations. These findings support skeptics’ claims that the urban heat island effect is substantially responsible for reports of rising temperatures.

James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Activist Group Delays ‘Green’ Utah Oil Shale Project

By Bonner R. Cohen

Environmental activists delayed the launch of an environmentally friendly oil shale project in southeastern Utah’s Unita Valley, pending the outcome of more study of the project’s expected effect on groundwater near the site.

State Approved Project

Earlier this year the Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining awarded an oil shale production permit to Red Leaf Resources, an energy company that emphasizes environmentally friendly oil shale production.

Living Rivers, a Moab, Utah-based environmental activist group, objected to the permit, claiming Red Leaf’s project would jeopardize groundwater in the region.

In late June, Red Leaf and Living Rivers agreed to let the Utah Water Quality Division study the project and release a report before Red Leaf begins resource production in the region. In the interim, the company’s permit will be set aside, and Red Leaf Resources plans to seek a new permit once the state water agency’s review has been completed.

Setting aside the permit while state environmental officials perform more studies will cost Red Leaf a substantial amount of money. In March, Red Leaf announced a $200 million joint venture with French energy giant Total SA to produce oil under thousands of acres of land in Utah. The companies had hoped to begin operation within 18 months of receiving their permit.

Oil Shale vs. Shale Oil

The United States has enormous reserves of oil shale, concentrated primarily in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Oil shale is something of a misnomer because it is neither oil nor necessarily found in shale rock. It is sedimentary rock that contains kerogen, a solid, organic material that, when heated to high temperatures, releases petroleum-like substances. Those substances can be processed into liquid fuels.

Oil shale is different from shale oil, also known as tight oil. Shale oil is conventional oil found in shale rock, often along with natural gas. Unlike oil shale, shale oil can be extracted using the twin modern technologies of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, or fracking.

In the United States, shale oil is found in prodigious amounts in such places as the Bakken Formation (North Dakota and Montana), Barnett Formation (north central Texas), Eagle Ford Formation (south Texas), and Utica Shale (eastern Ohio).

Emerging Energy Source

Though it has enormous potential as an energy source, oil shale development has been held back by the challenges posed by its extraction. Oil shale must be mined and converted to fuels through a multi-step process. In the case of the Red Leaf Resources/Total SA joint venture, the waxy shale would be dug up, placed in a clay-lined mine cavity, and heated with gas to at least 650 degrees Fahrenheit to convert the kerogen to oil and natural gas.

The dramatic rise in the price of oil in recent years, coupled with advances in extraction technology, have made shale oil and shale gas the most highly sought-after newer energy sources in the world. Similar strides in technology may also make oil shale commercially viable in the near future. For now, however, Red Leaf Resources and Total SA will have to await the results of Utah’s Water Quality Division’s analysis.

“The United States has over two trillion barrels of oil shale, but, for now, those resources are off-limits,” noted Daniel Simmons, director of state policy at the Institute for Energy Research.

“Most of the oil shale is on federal lands, and the Obama administration has shown no interest in the exploration and development of these prodigious energy reserves,” Simmons explained. “That is why projects on private or state lands, like the Red Leaf Resources project, are so important. The future of energy in the United States is bright, but only if we have access to the vast resources beneath our feet.”

“Red Leaf has pioneered state-of-the-art environmentally friendly technologies,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Even conventional production technologies have proven to have minimal environmental impact, so allowing Red Leaf to produce oil shale should be a no-brainer. It is a shame this project, along with the wealth creation and job creation, is being put in limbo.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research.
Bird Conservancy Sues Feds for Wind Turbine Information

By Brian Fojtik

The American Bird Conservancy has filed suit in federal court accusing the U.S. government of “flagrantly violating” the Freedom of Information Act by failing to appropriately respond to its FOIA requests for correspondence between the federal government and wind power companies.

The group is seeking information about bird populations potentially impacted by proposed wind energy projects, as well as bird deaths documented at wind energy facilities.

Illusory Transparency

“It’s ridiculous that Americans have to sue in order to find out what their government is saying to wind companies about our wildlife—a public trust,” said Kelly Fuller, the wind campaign manager for the conservancy. “The American Bird Conservancy is concerned that many of these projects have the potential to take a devastating toll on songbirds, majestic eagles, and threatened and endangered species.”

In his first month in office, President Barack Obama issued a memorandum to all federal agencies concerning the proper application of the Freedom of Information Act, stating “a democracy requires accountability, and accountability requires transparency.”

Obama told agency heads that FOIA “should be administered with a clear presumption: In the face of doubt, openness prevails.”

Wind Power’s Deadly Toll

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), approximately 440,000 birds were killed by wind turbines in 2009. Conservationists say the actual number of bird deaths is likely much higher, as FWS bases its estimates on carcasses actually discovered in the vicinity of wind turbines, yet many more birds likely fly away after being wounded and die outside the vicinity of the wind turbine. Others are likely scavenged by other animals before they can be discovered and counted.

In addition, the number of wind energy facilities has grown significantly since 2009, so the current number of bird deaths is likely higher for that reason, as well.

Feds Refuse to Cooperate

In May of this year the conservancy and 60 other organizations asked committees in the House and Senate for Congressional oversight of FWS’s implementation of new voluntary guidelines for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating the impacts of wind energy on wildlife.

In a March letter rejecting the conservancy’s call for mandatory standards, FWS Director Daniel Ashe asserted the agency was being “meticulously transparent” in how it is addressing the impact of wind energy on wildlife and asked the conservancy for its assistance in assessing the effectiveness of the voluntary guidelines.

“Stonewalling FOIA requests is hardly ‘transparency,’” Fuller responded, “and without timely access to the crucial information held by the Service, evaluating the effectiveness of the guidelines will be impossible.”

Lisa Linowes, executive director of Industrial Wind Action, says politics and special interests are playing a greater role than environmental stewardship and wildlife protection.

“There is no question that decisions involving siting of wind turbines in sensitive areas have been compromised by politics,” Linowes said. “Scientists at FWS are under pressure not to rock the boat.”

Deadlines Ignored

The conservancy’s complaint alleges FWS and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are failing to comply with statutory deadlines for disclosure of information related to projects in 10 states.

Upon receiving a FOIA request, an agency has 20 working days to respond. Although the agency may grant itself an extension of 10 additional days in “unusual circumstances,” FOIA does not permit the government to delay a response indefinitely.

The conservancy has six outstanding FOIA requests—all more than eight months old—for correspondence related to projects in Arizona, California, Florida, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas.

FOIA requests regarding the Cape Wind offshore wind farm in Nantucket Sound “revealed that Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) employees were hesitant to raise objections to the project despite known risks to navigational radar,” said Linowes.

She continued, “If federal employees are afraid to raise concerns involving the safety of air travelers near wind turbines, there is no reason to expect more from our wildlife agencies. It’s reasonable to assume FWS does not want to be caught in the same way the FAA was.”

Kelly Fuller (kfuller@gmail.com) is president of Brownstone Communications.
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“This is a must-read compendium of the issue that has permeated virtually every aspect of life and public policy. Michaels and his high-powered team of experts address the exaggerations and outright falsehoods used to justify policy decisions.”

— JOSEPH D’ALEO
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A proposed solar power plant in the Mojave Desert will not have to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) now that Gov. Jerry Brown (D) has signed legislation exempting the project from the law.

Environmental groups argued against the exemption, saying the plant would despoil the desert landscape and harm threatened species.

Solar Project Exempted
Assembly Bill 1073 allows K Road Power to bypass the CEQA and go directly to the California Energy Commission (CEC) for clearance to build its 663-megawatt Calico Solar plant. As a result, the company will no longer need to obtain permits from local agencies.

The massive solar power plant will be located on 4,613 acres in the Pisgah Valley, a region that is home to desert tortoises, golden eagles, and bighorn sheep. This has raised the ire of environmental groups who say they want the program halted.

Environmentalists Outraged
On May 9, Sierra Club California and 12 other environmental groups sent a letter to John Perez, speaker of the California State Assembly, opposing the special treatment given the solar power plant. The environmental groups say the law is a special-interest favor drafted with the sole purpose of giving legislative preference to a single proposed solar photovoltaic project.

AB 1073 allows the Calico Solar Project to destroy thousands of acres of high-quality habitat for many declining species including the threatened desert tortoise, Mojave fringe-toed lizard, and Nelson’s bighorn sheep.

The Planning and Conservation League, a lobbying arm of environmental groups in California, sternly criticized Brown, stating the attempt to exempt so-called “green” projects from CEQA sounds like yet another opportunity for corporate interests to “greenwash” their legacy by setting up fake green projects that are not subject to a thorough environmental review.

Ongoing Cronyism
Katy Grimes, a reporter with CalWatchdog.com, says Brown is making a habit of signing exemptions to environmental quality laws for favored corporations and industries.

“The exemptions are sort of like executive orders, because they allow favored groups to bypass CEQA—California’s nutty environmental regulations. Gov. Brown has signed these orders a couple of times already for the NFL stadium they wanted to build in Los Angeles and also for high-speed rail,” Grimes explained.

“He keeps doing this so long as a favored project is billed as anything ‘green,’ but everyone else has to adhere to those rules. … When they talk about green jobs, what they are really talking about is taxpayer funded green jobs that will bolster the [labor] unions,” said Grimes.

‘Practicing Crony Capitalism’
Jon Coupal, president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, says California’s tax and regulatory climate is the most brutal in America, with CEO Magazine ranking California as the worst state in which to conduct business.

“What’s most galling about CEQA exemptions is that environmental extremists passed these laws that make it difficult to operate a business in California, yet if you are politically connected, then you are excused from them,” Coupal said. “The rules should apply to everyone, and if they’re too difficult for certain businesses to comply with, then they should be rescinded. Instead, Gov. Brown is practicing crony capitalism with his friends.”

By Kenneth Artz

By Bonner R. Cohen

San Francisco Board of Supervisors President David Chiu has introduced a measure that would require building owners who are required to have water drinking fountains to provide bottled water refill stations as well.

Reducing Use of Plastic
The legislation offered June 26 is designed to enable people to keep using, or recycling, plastic water bottles already in their possession, instead of tossing them away.

“Every 27 hours, Americans consume enough bottled water to circle the entire equator with plastic bottles stacked end to end,” said Chiu in a press statement.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the city’s Department of the Environment support Chiu’s bill, and it is being billed as a way to enhance public health while reducing plastic waste. Its backers say the filling-station requirement would save consumers money by giving them access to the city’s supply of water from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

If approved by the Board of Supervisors, the requirement would take effect next year.

San Francisco has been at war with plastic for years. The City by the Bay was the first municipality in the nation to ban plastic bags at supermarkets and chain drugstores. In 2007, then-Mayor Gavin Newsom issued a directive prohibiting the city’s departments from buying bottled water.

Uncertain Benefits
Environmental stewardship may motivate San Francisco’s war on plastic, but the environmental benefits of such a crusade are far from certain.

“These proposed regulations are expansive and have no environmental benefits,” said Angela Logomasini, director of risk studies at the Washington-based Competitive Enterprise Institute.

“After all, if people want to drink tap water, all they have to do is find a sink with a faucet. “Instead, many people choose bottled water because they find it convenient and sanitary and they prefer the taste,” Logomasini explained. “Try as they may, local officials, eager to impose their agenda on the citizenry, will never succeed in altering people’s preferences. What they will do is raise the cost of constructing and renovating buildings.”

Bonner R. Cohen, Ph.D. (bcohen@nationalcenter.org) is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research.
An Idaho couple need not wait until the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency follows through on its threat to impose $75,000 per day in fines before challenging the agency’s claim that the Clean Water Act forbids them from building a home on their land.

EPA issued Mike and Chantell Sackett a compliance order instructing them to forego plans to build a home on a half-acre of land. EPA claimed the land constitutes a wetland that is entitled to protection under the Clean Water Act. The couple sought a formal EPA hearing, but EPA declined to hold one.

The Sacketts then sued in federal court. EPA claimed the couple had no standing to sue because they had yet to suffer any harm or adverse action. The Sacketts could sue, EPA argued, only if they affirmatively defied EPA and began racking up $75,000 per day in fines.

This put the couple in a difficult dilemma: Abide by EPA’s questionable ruling and give up any opportunity to build on their land, even though EPA may be overreaching in its wetland determination, or begin building and face financial ruin if they fail to convince a federal court to overrule EPA’s determination.

**Court Rejects Bullying Tactics**
The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the Sacketts had a right to immediate judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act and could challenge EPA’s determination prior to building their home and becoming subject to exorbitant EPA fines.

“The EPA used bullying and threats of terrifying fines, and has made our life hell for the past five years,” Mike Sackett said in a public statement after the ruling. “Now the Supreme Court has come to our rescue.”

**Heavy-Handed EPA Treatment**
James Burling, director of property rights litigation for the Pacific Legal Foundation, which represented the Sacketts, says EPA is so used to getting its way and is so removed from consequences for its heavy-handedness that fairness doesn’t mean anything to the agency.

“Anybody from the outside looking at the facts of this case would say that no court should have ever taken [EPA’s side in the underlying dispute] because the facts were so bad for the EPA’s argument,” said Burling.

“This case means a lot to the ordinary homeowners and landowners, at least with respect to EPA administrative compliance orders, who can now subject EPA to judicial review,” Burling explained.

In an internal memorandum made public during the case, EPA said it wanted to be “onerous, tough and scary” to landowners, which it appeared to be in subjecting the Sacketts to $75,000 per day in fines if the couple considered challenging EPA by beginning construction of a home on their land.

“Without exaggeration, you have an agency that needs to be taken down a notch or two,” said Burling.

“Our goal here was to tell the story of the Sacketts as individuals,” Burling explained. “The regulatory state can keep big corporations in check, and corporations have the means to fight back, but as in this case, the state can grind down and destroy the individual. And if the Supreme Court gets that story, then the individual can prevail.”

**Time to Rein in EPA**
Jonathan H. Adler, director of the Center for Business Law and Regulation at Case Western Reserve University School of Law, says the Sacketts’ case never should have gone all the way to the Supreme Court.

“Threatening landowners with these kinds of penalties without proof of jurisdiction is pretty crazy. The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers need to take more seriously their regulatory jurisdiction instead of using 25-year-old regulations that are seriously out of date and have twice been rejected by the courts,” Adler said.

“This case sought to answer the question: What is the scope of federal power versus landowners in the context of the federal Clean Water Act? I think it says something about the sorry state of property rights protection that getting something as small as a chance to challenge the EPA’s ruling in court is seen as a big deal,” said Adler.

“EPA was created with the best of intentions, but the agency has become something entirely different than what was intended,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes *Environment & Climate News*.

“EPA has grabbed powers that were never granted and is exercising those powers to beat down citizens and protect its own interests rather than protect the environment. It is time to restore EPA to its original mission,” he added.

William Perry Pendley, president and chief legal officer of the Mountain States Legal Foundation, points out the Supreme Court is frustrated by Congress’s unwillingness to rein in EPA.

“After the Court’s ruling, Justice Alito told Congress that it needs to do its job and amend the Clean Water Act to clearly define what constitutes navigable water. In other words, the authority of the EPA needs to be defined by Congress,” Pendley said.

Pendley applauded the Supreme Court’s decision.

“Before, all you could do was comply with the agency or get yourself thrown in jail while being simultaneously fined up to $100,000 per day. Now you can go to court on it, and they have to bring in their experts and prove why your land is navigable water,” said Pendley.

*Kenneth Artz* (iamkenartz@hotmail.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Coalition Urges EPA to Defer to Alaska Officials Regarding Proposed Mine

By James M. Taylor, J.D.

A coalition of conservative and free-market policy groups has sent a letter to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson urging her to defer to Alaska state officials regarding a proposed mining operation on state land.

The proposed mine promises to be one of the most lucrative in the world, and the Pebble Partnership is taking unprecedented measures to ensure sound environmental stewardship at the mine. EPA has sent signals that it may take the unprecedented step of forbidding the Pebble Partnership from constructing the mine even before the partnership submits required environmental reports and proposals.

The text of the letter is at right:

James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.

Global warming is not a crisis.
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Muller Doubles Down on Flawed Data in Media Blitz

By James M. Taylor, J.D.

Revelations by meteorologist Anthony Watts and a team of scientists, who found half the global warming reported in the United States by government agencies is the product of scientifically unsupported “adjustments” to the data, did not stop University of California-Berkeley professor Richard Muller from doubing down on the flawed data.

Muller issued a press release claiming the government data prove global warming is real and is almost entirely caused by humans.

His claims, which he says are based on a soon-to-be released study, were immediately criticized by “alarmist” and “skeptic” climate scientists alike.

Muller’s Claims ‘an Embarrassment’

“Anthony [Watts]’s new results also undermine the latest claims by Richard Muller of BEST [Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature Project], as not only is Muller extracting data from mostly the same geographic areas as for the NCDC, GISS and CRU analyses, but he is accepting an older assessment of station siting quality as it affects the trends,” wrote climate scientist Roger Pielke Sr., a senior research scientist at the University of Colorado, on his Internet site.

Muller wrote a July 20 editorial in the New York Times reporting on his findings, but Pielke dismissed the editorial as relying on flawed methods and faulty data.

“In Richard Muller’s Op-Ed in the New York Times (see The Conversion of a Climate-Change Skeptic), he makes far-reaching conclusions based on his sparse knowledge of the uncertainties in multi-decadal land surface temperature record. His comments show what occurs when a scientist, with excellent research credentials within their area of scientific expertise, [goes] outside of their area of knowledge,” wrote Pielke.

“His latest BEST claims are, in my view, an embarrassment,” Pielke added.

No Link to Extreme Weather

Muller admitted alarmist claims of global warming causing extreme weather events are contradicted by the scientific evidence, which earned him the wrath of many alarmists despite his overall message of a human-caused global warming crisis.

Numerous media stories claim Muller and his reported findings have greater credibility because he is a self-proclaimed longtime global warming skeptic.

“Call me a converted skeptic. Three years ago I identified problems in previous climate studies that, in my mind, threw doubt on the very existence of global warming,” Muller wrote in his New York Times editorial. “Last year, following an intensive research effort involving a dozen scientists, I concluded that global warming was real and that the prior estimates of the rate of warming were correct. I’m now going a step further: Humans are almost entirely the cause.

“My total turnaround, in such a short time, is the result of careful and objective analysis by the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature project, which I founded with my daughter Elizabeth,” Muller added.

“Full marks for the professor’s scientific integrity,” wrote reporter Philip Ball in the U.K. Guardian.

Actually a Long-Time Alarmist

A review of Muller’s past statements on global warming, however, shows his recent claims that he is a longtime skeptic are inaccurate at best.

As far back as 2003, Muller wrote in Technology Review, “Let me be clear. My own reading of the literature and study of paleoclimate suggests strongly that carbon dioxide from burning of fossil fuels will prove to be the greatest pollutant of human history. It is likely to have severe and detrimental effects on global climate.”

Muller reiterated his alarmist beliefs many times in the years since, including his 2008 statement in an interview with wired.com: “There is a consensus that global warming is real. ... It’s going to get much, much worse.”

“Richard Muller is shamelessly promoting himself as something he is not, and his conclusions are nonsense on stilts that defy rational explanation.”

JO NOVA

SCIENCE WRITER
EIA Forecasts Bright Energy Future Thanks to Hydraulic Fracturing

By Cheryl K. Chumley

A

n abundance of domestic energy will enable the United States to cut in half its reliance on oil from the Middle East by the end of the decade, and could end any reliance at all by 2035, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA).

New Technologies Boost Outlook

America’s bright energy outlook is due to new technologies for hydraulic fracturing, extraction from oil sands, and deep-sea oil recovery, EIA explains in a newly released report.

The agency expects energy producers to more than double oil production in the rich Bakken shale formation in North Dakota during the next 20 years. Recent advances in hydraulic fracturing make such oil production economically possible, EIA explains.

Activists Threaten Production

EIA’s promising domestic energy forecast may nevertheless be derailed by environmental activists and government officials clamping down on energy production. Activist groups such as the Sierra Club oppose hydraulic fracturing, citing water pollution fears.

Federal, state, and local officials have scrutinized hydraulic fracturing for decades and have yet to document any instances of groundwater pollution from hydraulic fracturing. Even so, politicians have banned hydraulic fracturing in several states, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is sending signals it may severely restrict hydraulic fracturing in the near future.

Game-Changing Resources

“Hydraulic fracturing is a game-changing opportunity that can drive the nation’s energy future,” said Jack Gerard, president and CEO of the American Petroleum Institute.

He continued, “The shale energy revolution is doing more than helping workers and the economies of several of our states. It’s also contributing to a tilt in the world’s energy axis toward the Western Hemisphere and toward the United States. This realignment could affect the global energy landscape and economy for the rest of the century.”

In addition to the Bakken formation in North Dakota, the EIA report forecasts higher oil and natural gas output from the Eagle Ford shale formation in Texas, the Permian Basin that spans much of Texas and New Mexico, and the Monterey shale formation in California.

“The EIA report confirms that although America acts like an energy-poor nation, we are in fact an energy-rich nation,” observed Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News.

“North Dakota alone already produces more oil than OPEC nation Ecuador,” he said, “although that is only occurring because the oil is on private land rather than federal land. The federal government has outlawed oil production on federal lands with much more oil than North Dakota.”

EIA findings suggest American production from eight substantial oil plays will more than double to 1.23 million barrels each day between now and 2035—as long as environmental activists don’t shut it down.

The Bakken and Three Forks shale formations in North Dakota are the biggest oil producers in the nation. In April of this year the two sites produced 545,000 barrels per day, data from the North Dakota Industrial Commission show. Production in the Eagle Ford formation is rapidly growing also and may soon overtake Bakken and Three Forks production.

The Utica shale formation in Ohio is also very promising, according to EIA, though analysts have yet to get a good handle on how much energy production is possible there.

The EIA findings bode well for job creation, energy prices, and wealth creation.

“Many Americans are already aware that increased domestic oil and natural gas production as a result of hydraulic fracturing is putting hundreds of thousands of people to work, revitalizing local communities, and delivering added billions in revenues to state and federal governments,” Gerard said.

Cheryl Chumley (ckchumley@aol.com) is a digital editor with Times247.com.

Valero Suspends Operations at Ethanol Plants in Two States

By Alyssa Carducci

Valero Energy Company has temporarily suspended operations at two ethanol production plants due to high corn prices and low ethanol demand.

Valero suspended production at its Albion, Nebraska facility on June 19 and its Linden, Indiana facility on June 26. Valero is keeping eight other plants operational for now.

High Corn Prices Blamed

Company spokesman Bill Day said each of the closed production facilities has the capacity to produce 120 million gallons of ethanol per year.

“Linden and Albion both had higher-than-normal corn basis prices. Ethanol margins everywhere have been squeezed, but in those areas in particular they actually went negative due to high corn prices and lackluster gasoline demand. Still, ethanol prices remain below gasoline, so there is an incentive for discretionary blending,” Day said.

“Valero has made a smart economic choice in cutting back ethanol production, faced with significant price increases in the primary feedstock—corn,” said Tom Tanton, president of the California-based energy and technology consulting firm T2 & Associates.

Variable Production, Prices

Tanton points out ethanol producers are having a difficult time making an affordable, marketable product despite being given a guaranteed market share and generous federal and state subsidies. In addition, corn prices and the corn crop fluctuate significantly from year to year, making ethanol production less reliable than many people realize.

“Much of domestic corn is grown without the benefit of irrigation, so naturally droughts—or even less than average rainfall—can limit the production of the basic building block for ethanol,” Tanton explained.

“Maybe it is time to revisit renewable fuel mandates,” Tanton concluded.

Alyssa Carducci (ad.carducci@gmail.com) writes from Tampa, Florida.
Abound Solar Follows Solyndra into Bankruptcy

By Alyssa Carducci

Y et another alternative energy company financed by taxpayer subsidies has gone out of business, leaving taxpayers on the hook for millions of dollars.

Abound Solar, which specialized in high-tech solar panels, benefited from a $400 million federal loan guarantee but announced on June 28 it would be filing for bankruptcy. The Department of Energy cut off the guarantee at $68 million in September 2011, roughly the same time solar equipment manufacturer Solyndra went under in another high-profile bankruptcy.

Can’t Compete with Chinese

Abound Solar planned to produce solar panels using the chemical cadmium telluride, which the company claimed would be less expensive than competing crystalline silicon technology. Nevertheless, silicon panels made in China remain less expensive than anything Abound Solar can produce in the foreseeable future, sending the company into bankruptcy.

“Aggressive pricing actions from Chinese solar panel companies have made it very difficult for an early stage startup company like Abound to scale in current market conditions,” the company explained in a press statement.

Picking Winners and Losers

Critics of the federal loan guarantee program for alternative energy companies say government officials should have foreseen the repeated failure of subsidized companies.

“One of the most important things free markets do is weed out companies that can’t perform,” said Daniel Simmons, director of regulatory and state affairs at the Institute for Energy Research. “Yet the federal government has tried time and time again to outsmart the market. Once again government has failed and squandered taxpayers’ dollars in the bargain.”

The U.S. Department of Energy refused to acknowledge the subsidies are a bad idea.

“America must continue playing to win in the clean energy race,” DOE argued in a statement sent to Environment & Climate News. “We need not allow our dependence on foreign oil to be followed with a dependence on foreign solar panels and wind turbines. Instead, we can and must fight to ensure that the next generation of solar panels is invented in America by American innovators, built in America by American workers, and sold around the world.”

Layoffs Coming

Abound Solar, based in Loveland, Colorado, will lay off 125 employees.

“This just underscores how ridiculous this program is,” said Rep. Jim Jordan (R-OH), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight, and Government Spending.

“Our government is not good at picking winners and losers in the marketplace but has certainly proved it is good at wasting taxpayer dollars,” Jordan added. “The committee noted that this level of risk is unacceptable for taxpayers.”

“As companies like Abound and Solyndra show, the federal government has no business guaranteeing loans,” said Simmons.

Alyssa Carducci (ad.carducci@gmail.com) writes from Tampa, Florida.

Cuomo Nears Fracking Decision in New York

By Bonner R. Cohen

A fter months of study, punctuated by a highly emotional public debate, New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo will soon announce his decision on whether to allow natural gas production through hydraulic fracturing.
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Disgraced Former EPA Official Joins Sierra Club

By Kenneth Artz

Armendariz joined the Sierra Club as a spokesman against fossil fuel companies, and has accepted a job as a top staffer at the Sierra Club as a spokesman against coal-fired power plants.

Armendariz joined the Sierra Club as a senior campaign representative for the group’s “Beyond Coal” campaign.

Fits Right in at Sierra Club

Armendariz was appointed to the EPA post by President Barack Obama in 2010, but he resigned after the release of a video showing him proclaiming EPA’s “general philosophy” is to “crucify” and “make examples” of oil and gas companies so that others are “really easy to manage.”

Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK), ranking member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, facetiously congratulated Armendariz on his new job.

“I would like to congratulate Dr. Armendariz for his new job as a key player in the Sierra Club’s Beyond Coal campaign. At least at the Sierra Club he won’t get into so much trouble for telling the truth that their true agenda is to kill oil, gas, and coal,” Inhofe said in a press statement.

“Dr. Armendariz follows numerous Obama administration officials who have come from or moved to radical left and green groups—it’s as if there is a revolving door between the White House and organizations such as the Sierra Club and the Center for American Progress,” Inhofe added. “Don’t forget that the Sierra Club has endorsed President Obama, and several EPA officials have publically admitted that they are working hand and glove with far left green groups to end fossil fuel development in America.”

History of Extremism

H. Sterling Burnett, a senior fellow with the National Center for Policy Analysis, notes Armendariz was an environmental extremist long before joining EPA.

“Armendariz has always been an activist, so when he was appointed by President Obama, the liberals downplayed his past as an activist and instead stressed his academic credentials. They did this because they didn’t want anyone to realize he would be an activist in government.

“I don’t think he can do more mischief at the Sierra Club than he could in his position in the federal government,” Burnett added. “The Sierra Club is simply going to continue what they were doing before he joined them. They will continue to lobby, sue, and halt economic process in support of their environmental extremism and political goals.”

Kathleen Hartnett White, director of the Armstrong Center for Energy & the Environment at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, says it is not surprising Armendariz wound up at the Sierra Club.

“He was very much an activist before he was appointed to the EPA, and in many cases he already had a conclusion before doing the research. He very much demonstrated that he wanted corporations to be very fearful of the regulatory agency,” White explained.

Kenneth Artz (iamkenartz@hotmail.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.

The Patriot’s Toolbox

On February 19, 2009, CNBC commentator Rick Santelli stood on the trading floor of the Chicago Board of Trade and called for a “new tea party” to protest out-of-control spending by politicians in Washington. Little did he know that his words would become the rallying call for millions of Americans, many of them getting involved in politics for the very first time.
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U.S. Green ‘Investments’ Drown in Red Ink

By Deroy Murdock

“W”

e’ll invest $15 billion a year over
the next decade in renewable
energy, creating five million new green
jobs that pay well, can’t be outsourced,
and help end our dependence on foreign
oil,” candidate Barack Obama pledged in
a November 1, 2008 radio address.

Three years and eight months later, as
unemployment has exceeded 8 percent
for 41 straight months, Obama seems
incapable of keeping this promise. With
the worst employment figures since at
least 1948, when the Bureau of Labor
Statistics started measuring them,
Obama has made a dog’s breakfast of
jobs—green and otherwise.

Expensive Key Programs

Consider three key Department of
Energy (DOE) programs. DOE’s Web
site boasts that its “clean energy” initia-
tives—dubbed 1703, 1705, and Advanced
Technology Vehicles Manufactur-
ing (ATVM)—loaned $34.7 billion and
launched “nearly 60,000” jobs. This totals
a staggering $578,333 per position.

According to the Bureau of Economic
Analysis, private employers pay average
workers $62,757 in wages and benefits.
So, Obama is “creating jobs” at 922 per-
cent of the private sector’s cost. Thus,
for every green job that Obama suppos-
edly spawns with taxpayer dollars and
borrowed Chinese money, private enter-
prises could hire nine people.

Ten ‘Clean’ Failures

Obama touts green-energy “investments,”
even though this is not his money to
invest. Rather than choose winners and
losers, which would be bad enough, Team
Obama picks losers. It subsidized at least
10 “clean” companies that went kaput:
• Abound Solar consumed $70 million
of its $400 million Energy Department
loan guarantee. The Loveland, Colorado-
based company blamed Chinese subsidy
payments and European subsidy cuts
for falling prices in its thin-film-panel
sector. On July 2, Abound Solar filed for
Chapter 7 liquidation and prepared to
lock shop and fire its 125 employees.
• Solar Trust envisioned Earth’s larg-
est solar power plant. DOE enthusiasti-
cally offered it a $2.1 billion loan guaran-
tee in April 2011, provided that it raised
private capital. Interior Secretary Ken
Salazar attended the company’s Blythe,
California groundbreaking and hailed “a
historic moment in America’s new en-
ergy frontier.” Solar Trust missed DOE’s
benchmarks, however, and announced
Chapter 11 bankruptcy on April 2, 2012.
• Energy Conversion Devices, a solar-
lamine supplier, received a $13.3 mil-
lion federal stimulus tax credit in Janu-
ary 2010 to update its Auburn Hills,
Michigan factory and hire some 600
people. ECD declared Chapter 11 bank-
• Ener1 received a $118.5 million DOE
stimulus grant in August 2009. Vice
President Joe Biden traveled to Green-
field, Indiana to tour Ener1 on January
26, 2011. “Here at Ener1,” Biden said,
“we’re going to harness electricity and
bring it to the world, like Edison did
more than a century ago.” The electric-
car battery company filed for Chapter 11
bankruptcy on January 26, 2012, exactly
one year after Biden’s visit.
• Aptera Motors aspired to build three-
wheel electric cars. DOE offered it a
$150 million ATVM loan, conditioned
on Aptera’s raising $150 million in non-
government capital. Aptera never con-
vinced private investors to finance glori-
fied tricycles. So, on December 2, 2012,
CEO Paul Wilber stated, “After years of
focused effort to bring our products to
the market, Aptera Motors is closing its
doors, effective today.”
• Massachusetts-based Beacon Power
Corp. received a $43 million loan guaran-
tee in October 2010—DOE’s second such subsidy. The energy storage con-
cern declared Chapter 11 bankruptcy on
October 30, 2011.
• Solyndra, the most notorious of
Obama’s green-energy baubles, filed for
bankruptcy on August 31, 2011. Taxpay-
ers are liable for this solar-panel maker’s
$535 million in loan guarantees—the
first DOE made under Obama.

Investments Weren’t Green

In death, Solyndra has proved to be
anything but green. As San Francisco’s
KCBS-TV reported in April, Solyndra’s
Milpitas, California facility fea-
tures metal drums marked “Hazardous
Waste.” Cadmium, lead, unidentified
black chemicals, and other toxins haunt
the premises. A company called iStar
said it would remove these poisons—as
soon as Solyndra pays its bills.
Solyndra also discarded still-va-

• Raser Technologies received a
$33 million Treasury Department stim-
ulus grant in February 2010. As its
dreams of a geothermal plant in Beav-
er County, Utah turned to steam, its
payroll subsequently evaporated from
42 workers to 27 to 10. Raser declared
Chapter 11 bankruptcy in April 2011.
• Despite Mountain Plaza, Inc.’s 2003
bankruptcy, EPA decided to inject
$424,000 in stimulus funds for that Ten-
nessee company’s “truck-stop electrifica-
tion” technology. Mountain Plaza again
went bankrupt on June 3, 2010. EPA
officially awarded those funds 12 days
later, despite Mountain Plaza’s insolv-
ency and a related lawsuit.

These doomed projects alone devoured
$3.4 billion in taxpayer funds and com-
mitments.

President Obama should beg taxpay-
ers’ forgiveness for pouring their hard-
earned cash down at least ten “green”
rat holes.

“Massachusetts-based
Beacon Power Corp.
received a $43 mil-
lion loan guarantee in
October 2010—DOE’s
second such subsidy. The
energy storage concern declared
Chapter 11 bankruptcy on October 30,
2011.”

Deroy Murdock is a Fox News contribu-
tor, a nationally syndicated columnist
with the Scripps Howard News Service, and a media fellow with the Hoover
Institution at Stanford University. This
column was originally published by
National Review Online and is reprinted
with the author’s permission.
NH Curbs Participation in Low-Carbon Fuel Programs

By Alyssa Carducci

The New Hampshire legislature has enacted legislation prohibiting state officials from creating or participating in a low-carbon fuel program without first getting approval from the legislature.

The legislature passed House Bill 1847 on June 21, and Gov. John Lynch (D) allowed the bill to become law without his signature.

Bad Experience with RGGI

New Hampshire is a member of the nine-state Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), which aims to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in northeastern states. RGGI has proven costly for participating states, raising electricity prices by inducing states to use more expensive alternative energy.

Legislators in New Hampshire and other states are considering withdrawing from RGGI as a result. Last year, New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie issued an executive order withdrawing the state’s membership.

“RGGI has proven to be unnecessary, ineffective, and nothing more than a tax on energy use,” said Todd Wynn, director of the energy, environment, and agricultural task force at the American Legislative Exchange Council.

The new law is seen as a compromise between legislators seeking to pull New Hampshire out of RGGI and advocates of carbon dioxide reductions.

Costly unilateral efforts by the federal government or individual states to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are doomed to failure, Wynn said.

“A few isolated states cannot have any significant impact on global greenhouse gas emissions, as developing countries will overwhelm any unilateral reductions,” he explained.

Meaningful or Just Symbolic?

Colin Manning, a spokesman for Lynch, said the new law is largely symbolic.

“As a practical matter, this bill does not change our current practice, as our Department of Environmental Services seeks legislative approval before entering into programs like these. Therefore, the governor let the bill become law without his signature,” said Manning.

The new law will allow the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services to participate in regional and national discussions of low-carbon fuel programs. The department must report to a fiscal committee on a semi-annual basis all expenses resulting from the department’s discussions.

RGGI Results Debated

Lynch reported the state raised $16 million in tax revenue through its participation in RGGI through the end of 2010. Wynn, however, says the revenue comes at a significant price.

“A tax on energy use will no doubt raise revenue for the state, but it comes at the expense of higher electricity rates, a cost borne most severely by those with lower incomes. Nearly 50 percent of U.S. households earn less than $50,000 per year, and these households spend more on energy than on food, spend twice as much on energy as on health care, and spend more on energy than on anything else except housing,” Wynn explained.

“Increases in energy prices will mean that Americans have less money in their pockets to purchase health care, healthy food, exercise, shelter, and many other essentials for a healthy and long life,” said Wynn.

Alyssa Carducci (ad.carducci@gmail.com) writes from Tampa, Florida.
Private Donors Step Up to Keep Calif. State Parks Open

By Kenneth Artz

Private donors are stepping up to help California keep its state parks open, allowing state officials to forego plans to close 70 of California’s 278 state parks.

Low Attendance, Revenues

The Parks and Recreation Department had targeted the 70 state parks for closure due to low attendance and low revenues. Parks and Recreation Director Ruth Coleman said with proposed budget cuts over the next two years, the state could no longer afford to operate all the parks within the system.

Now, private donations will allow the state to keep the parks open at least through the end of the year.

California is second to Alaska in terms of the most acreage set aside for state parks. Low attendance and low revenues, however, have many wondering whether the state has set aside too much land.

Advocates of extensive state parks failed in a recent attempt to raise more tax money for California’s parks system. In November 2010, voters rejected Proposition 21, an $18 registration fee hike for vehicles that would have raised an estimated $500 million for state parks.

Present System Unsustainable

H. Sterling Burnett, a senior fellow with the National Center for Policy Analysis, says even though private donors have stepped up to the plate for now, California’s state park system is not sustainable in its current form.

“Every acre set aside as parkland is taken off the tax rolls in a time when the state faces a massive budget deficit and cities are toppling like dominoes to bankruptcy. As it now stands, the parks are subsidized by the taxpayers in an era when the state is $48 billion in the red. To me, that’s crazy,” Burnett said.

Burnett says privatization offers a viable long-term solution.

“If at least some of these parks were sold to private interests, businesses, jobs, and tax revenue would be created. In a time when we are worried about creating jobs, the state legislature is instead worried about keeping parks open,” Burnett explained.

“I don’t question whether they have the right to have a state park system, but I do question whether it’s wise to have such an extensive number of parks. If it’s wise to do so, how many parks do you need?” Burnett asked.

Jon Coupal, president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, agrees.

“When legislators threaten to shut things down, they always come up with the money at the last moment and later use this as an excuse to raise taxes. And when the voters don’t approve the taxes, then they threaten all sorts of doom and gloom,” said Coupal.

Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News, wondered why people want ever more land taken away from the people and turned over to government.

“Not only is freedom preserved when people own their own property, but individuals are more likely to be good stewards of land than are government bureaucrats,” said Lehr.

Presenting Another Model

Leonard Gilroy, director of government reform at the California-based Reason Foundation, recommends a public-private partnership for state parks.

“The U.S. Forestry Service already has over 25 years’ worth of successful experience with public-private partnership. By allowing private companies to take over day-to-day operations of the state parks, California can take a revenue-using public park and turn it into a revenue-generating asset for the state,” Gilroy said.

California recently signed its first corporate agreement with American Land & Leisure Co., which will oversee daily operations of three state parks for five years. Three other state parks also are slated for private management. American Land & Leisure will run all concessions, visitor services, and security, and it will assume the parks’ legal liabilities while the state maintains ownership of the park lands.

“This is a big first step for California,” said Gilroy. “Although many people worry about private companies turning state parks into Disneyland or building a McDonald’s on them, that will never happen because the private companies have contracts that state specifically what they can or cannot do. For all intents and purposes, they will look, breathe, and act like California state parks.”

Economic Benefits Possible

Gilroy noted private companies are likely to operate state parks in a more economically prudent manner.

“The labor model changes the minute a private company starts running state parks. For instance, a lot of highly paid park rangers are employed by the state, and they’re there year-round. They have expensive health and retirement plans, but a lot of what they do could be considered menial work such as picking up trash or cleaning bathrooms. A private company can hire seasonal and part-time workers, allowing the park rangers to do more important things at the park,” said Gilroy.

“California’s state parks are looking at $1 billion in deferred maintenance costs, so we’re going to have to be creative if we want to keep them open,” Gilroy added.

“State park systems around the country are all in the same boat—the money just isn’t there anymore. And what’s left is being fought over in a game of budgetary football, where the parks don’t stand much of a chance of winning. So if the choice is between shutting them down or allowing private companies to operate them, then I’m sure people will make the right decision.”

Kenneth Artz (iamkenartz@hotmail.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
ClimateWiki.org
Heartland’s climate change encyclopedia

ClimateWiki is an encyclopedia of climate change research organized by topic. If you are new to the issue, consider reading the Introduction to Global Warming. If you are already well versed in the issue, search the Featured Categories in the search box to the right or use some of the other navigation tools on this page.

ClimateWiki is moderated and edited by The Heartland Institute, “the world’s most prominent think tank promoting skepticism about man-made climate change.” [The Economist, May 26, 2012].

Interested in becoming a contributor? Visit heartland.org or email think@heartland.org.
New Book Documents the Flaws in Environmental ‘Classic,’ Silent Spring

Review by Jay Lehr

I have been writing about Rachel Carson’s infamous book Silent Spring for much of the 50 years since its publication. With ten years of environmental education behind me when the book was published in 1962, it was immediately obvious that this was not a work of science but rather a compilation of anecdotal data and selective scientific studies to make points that fit the author’s philosophy of how the Earth should be.

Ms. Carson has caused the deaths of more people by malaria as a result of the withdrawal of DDT than have been killed in all the wars and by all the tyrannical leaders of the twentieth century.

Now, a distinguished group of authors has studied every flawed paragraph in Silent Spring and the terrible impacts it has had on society. Their complete work will be available in September from the Cato Institute; a booklet version has been published in advance by PERC, the Property and Environment Research Center, in Bozeman, Montana, and is available free of charge. (This review is of the booklet version, authored by Meiners and Morriss alone.)

You will never find a more informative and clearly written explanation of why Carson’s book became a bible of the environmental movement despite presenting almost no accurate facts.

Reputable Scientist Turned Activist

Carson was a marine biologist whose earlier publications on the oceans and marine life were fine works of nature writing. Her strong reputation, built upon these earlier writings, led many willing environmentalists to accept as fact the countless distortions in Silent Spring.

In Silent Spring (a title drawn from her assertion that the anti-malaria chemical DDT was causing bird deaths), Carson shifted from documenting nature’s beauty to advocating positions linked to a darker tradition in American environmental activist circles.

Meiners and Morriss put it bluntly: “Above all, Silent Spring is a work of advocacy, weaving anecdotes and carefully selected bits of science into a compelling brief against the use of chemicals that had already saved millions of lives at the time Carson wrote.”

Bad Data, Rank Speculation

Carson used unsubstantiated data to argue pesticides increase cancer, and she touted animal studies where animals were given chemical doses tens of thousands of times the concentrations that occur in the real world.

Carson began her book with what became one of its most famous passages, describing a town where there were no songbirds. At the end of this section, titled “A Fable for Tomorrow,” Carson warned of what might happen if pesticide use were not curtailed. Meiners and Morriss assemble a litany of facts showing how fraudulently she presented her case.

Carson presented scare scenarios of pesticides killing birds, most notably bald eagles, while bird counts conducted by the Audubon Society documented that bird populations were in fact rising. Since Carson was an active member of her local chapter of the Audubon Society and served on its board of directors, she must have been aware of the Audubon bird counts.

Benefits Ignored

Meiners, and Morriss explain that Silent Spring “ignored the benefits of pesticides for both human well-being and the environment. These include reductions in habitat loss and biodiversity, lessened hunger, increased no-till farming, reduced erosion and agricultural runoff and more agricultural activity.”

I cannot convey the importance of this booklet and the forthcoming book better than environmental scientist Henry Miller of the Hoover Institution does on its back cover: “Meiners and Morriss offer a much needed perspective on one of the most misguided and over-praised books of the 20th century. However noble her intentions, in Silent Spring, Rachel Carson provided the impetus for a half century of environmental policies that have cost hundreds of millions of lives and elicited antagonism toward many products and technologies that could have benefitted the planet and its inhabitants.”

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (jlehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute.
It’s Time to Start Testing Organic Food

Editor’s Note: This article is the first in a series of articles on modern agriculture and organic farming.

By Mischa Popoff and Jay Lehr

There can be no mistaking the fact that modern agriculture is under attack. Gone are the days of saving the whales or attacking logging companies for cutting down trees. The latest environmental “bad guy” is the farmer who grows the food you feed your family.

This attack against farming has occurred mainly in the form of sustained and very negative public relations campaigns, but it also has made its way into the nation’s courtrooms. It comes generally from environmental activists, but more specifically from a sect within the organic food industry that levels a constant barrage of unfounded attacks against any form of food that isn’t certified organic.

But through all of the allegations that the modern American food system is unsafe, that it’s unsustainable and even toxic, the organic activist sect harbors a dirty little secret: Organic crops and livestock are not tested before they are certified. This allows the well-funded organic lobby to turn a blind eye to unethical practices and behavior within its own ranks in order to keep money flowing into its coffers.

Activists Oppose Testing

It should come as no surprise that with money on the line, this activist element opposes the introduction of mandatory, across-the-board, unannounced organic field testing, knowing it will undermine their political and legal fundraising efforts. Meanwhile, true rank-and-file organic farmers across the United States have no affinity whatsoever for these mainly urban political activists who claim to represent them.

Honest organic farmers support field testing because they know better than anyone that they have nothing to hide.

Considering that America’s food system is perfectly safe and one of the most efficient the world has ever known, and considering that only clean air and water are more important to the smooth functioning of an economy than food, we urge every American to defend the nation’s food system against these attacks from a movement that, among its most prominent proponents at least, really doesn’t have a leg to stand on.

What’s that expression about how people in glass houses should not throw stones?

Organic food could, someday, be legitimate. In fact, we believe it should be legitimate. At present, however, it’s not, due entirely to the lack of field testing in the organic sector.

Message Behind the Label

Most food safety monitoring and enforcement is done behind the scenes. It never appears on a label, and consumers rightly take it for granted.

But wait—what’s this? A certified organic label on the store shelf? What is the message a consumer is supposed to glean from this, especially now that this label comes replete with the imprimatur of no less august an institution than the U.S. Department of Agriculture? The message is that this food is purer, more nutritious, safer, and more sustainable than conventional, more efficiently produced food. That’s what we’ve been led to believe.

Sadly, none of these claims is true. A couple of them could be true, someday, if organic field testing were used as an enforcement tool. But, and this is crucial, the promotion of any such claims should never occur at the expense of the regular, conventional, nonorganic food industry.

America’s food system is perfectly safe and provides abundant affordable and nutritious food to the United States and beyond. No one should get away with implying otherwise, especially in order to advance a thinly veiled political agenda that economically benefits an industry group.

Exaggerated Organic Claims

Although a handful of organic farmers across the United States do indeed produce certified-organic food that can be purer and possibly even a little more nutritious (the first two of the four claims noted above) than some conventionally produced food, organic food is not by any scientific measure “safer” than regular food. After all, pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers are all perfectly safe when used according to the directions.

Nor can organic food, by its very nature, ever be considered more sustainable than conventionally produced food. After all, since pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers are not being used, more fossil fuel is required and more CO2 is emitted per acre and per bushel of food produced in order to kill the weeds in every field.

Moreover, if there is a possibility that organic food could, someday, in all instances, always be purer and offer elevated levels of nutrition, why isn’t this the case right now? The answer, disturbingly, is because the USDA’s National Organic Program (NOP) avoids serious scientific scrutiny. It provides basically no oversight to ensure that food labeled USDA certified-organic is even close to being truly organic.

This is the case even for “organic” food imported into the United States from countries with notoriously lax environmental standards, such as China, Mexico, and Brazil. You read that right; even imported food can bear the USDA’s good name on its label, all based on paperwork, without a single test to verify purity or nutritional value.

Mischa Popoff (think@heartland.org) is a former organic farmer, a USDA-accredited Organic Crop Inspector, and author of the book Is It Organic? Jay Lehr (jlehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute.
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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/t2lt/uahncdc.lt
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GLOBAL AVERAGE

The global average temperature for June was 0.37°C above normal.

NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

The Northern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.55°C above normal.

SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE

The Southern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.20°C above normal.
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