Oregon Senate Rejects Bill to Extend Clean Fuels Program

By Alyssa Carducci

The Oregon Senate has rejected a bill that would have extended the state’s Clean Fuels Program beyond its scheduled 2015 expiration date.

Oregon environmental activist groups made extending the transportation fuel restrictions their top priority during the 2013 legislative session, but the Democrat-controlled state Senate determined the Clean Fuels Program did not warrant an extension.

2009 Bill Targeted Carbon

The Clean Fuels Program, enacted by the legislature in 2009, requires a 10 percent cut in the carbon intensity of
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Fla. Water Managers May Sell Some State Lands

By Bonner R. Cohen

Under a directive from Republican Gov. Rick Scott to assess whether the public lands they manage are fulfilling their “core missions,” Florida state agencies are taking inventory of state-owned lands for possible sale back to the people.

The South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) launched the inventory assessment with the most potential for impact, beginning a “land assessment process” that will determine the fate of the 1.5 million acres (more than 2,300 square miles) it oversees.

Accumulated over the years primarily for conservation purposes, SFWMD’s properties include wildlife habitat and
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EPA Is a Rogue Agency
The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the nation’s leading job killer, implementing and enforcing laws that impose impossible regulatory burdens on American businesses. EPA has perverted the Clean Air Act by declaring carbon dioxide a “pollutant,” despite the plain intent of the law’s authors to exclude such naturally occurring gases, and despite major flaws in the science used to claim carbon dioxide endangers human health.

The Solution
Congress must rein in EPA through deep cuts in the size, power, and cost of the agency. Congress can repeal EPA’s authority to regulate carbon dioxide in the name of “global warming,” and it can demand cost-benefit analysis be applied to all environmental regulations.

The Petition
The Citizen’s Petition to Rein in the Environmental Protection Agency calls out EPA’s unscientific and destructive campaign to frighten people over the threat of man-made global warming and demands “deep cuts in the size, power, and cost of the EPA.” You can sign it online at www.heartland.org, or print out copies and fax signed copies to 312/377-5000, or mail them to us at The Heartland Institute, One South Wacker Drive #2740, Chicago, IL 60606.

You Can Help! By working together, we can rein in the Environmental Protection Agency! We can protect the environment without sacrificing jobs or our essential freedoms. Please help us by signing the petition today.
Hawaii Is at the Forefront of Genetically Modified Crops

By H. Sterling Burnett

When people think of Hawaii, they probably imagine beautiful sunsets over white sand beaches, bountiful waves, colorful clothing, and spasmodic volcanos.

For the average person, what probably doesn’t leap to mind when thinking about Hawaii is the food they eat and Hawaii’s agriculture industry. It should, however, because Hawaii is at the forefront of modern, high-output agriculture: biotech farming.

Salvation after Sugar Collapse

Biotech agricultural companies took advantage of the collapse of Hawaii’s sugar industry in the 1980s to buy land and introduce genetically modified crops for research and ultimately commercial seed sale. Hawaii’s climate makes it ideal for biotech experimentation and new varietal development because it allows biotech companies to get three or four planting seasons in every year.

From tiny acorns, mighty oaks grow, and so it has been with Hawaii’s seed industry. Companies including DuPont, Pioneer, Syngenta, Dow, BASF, and Monsanto all operate in Hawaii. From humble beginnings, the seed industry, at more than $243 million annually, is the largest segment of Hawaii’s agricultural sector. In 2010, the agriculture companies exported more than 9.7 million pounds of seed, half of which was genetically modified. The seed industry alone employs approximately 1,400 people.

Seed companies point out genetically enhanced crops both provide employment and keep land in agricultural use, when fertile farmland elsewhere is being developed for other uses.

Biotech’s Environmental Benefits

Environmental activists have raised a variety of objections to the planting of biotech crops in Hawaii, including that they are harmful to human health and encourage the indiscriminate use of chemicals. The answer to these charges in Hawaii, as elsewhere, seems to be, “where’s the evidence?” Despite hundreds of studies, none has found legitimate evidence of harm to public health from genetically modified crops that have gone into commercial production. Instead, genetically modified crops are improving human nutrition by increasing crop yields and making food less expensive.

Similarly, genetically modified crops are improving the environment. Improving crop yields means less land is developed for food production. Also, some genetic modifications allow farmers to reduce the amount of pesticides needed—the plants are engineered to enhance their own natural defenses against insects and weeds or to use defenses imported from other subspecies or species. A second type of modification enables a crop to withstand higher doses of certain pesticides when such pesticides are needed for crop protection.

“Study after study shows that the development of biotech crops has improved the environmental performance in agriculture,” said Greg Conko, executive director of the Competitive Enterprise Institute. “It has reduced the need to spray chemical insecticides and reduced the amount of older, more environmentally harmful herbicides, replacing their use with more benign, less toxic herbicides with limited persistence in the environment.”

“Genetic modification has enhanced food production in the United States and throughout the world while simultaneously improving environmental conditions,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Genetic modification breakthroughs are among the greatest scientific advances of the past century.”

More Viable Papaya Crop

In Hawaii, seed crops are not the only things that are being bioengineered. Along with corn, which is the largest crop, wheat, soybean, sorghum, and canola are also benefiting from genetic modification.

In addition, in the late 1980s, the University of Hawaii began developing a papaya strain resistant to the Papaya Ringspot Virus. The new genetically modified papaya plants are no longer susceptible to infection, allowing farmers to cultivate the fruit even when the historically debilitating virus is widespread.

Hawaiian farmers began commercially growing the first virus-resistant papayas in 1999. Bioengineered papayas now cover approximately 2,400 acres, three-quarters of the total Hawaiian papaya crop.

These papayas have been approved for consumption both in the United States and in Canada, and several Asian countries are developing genetically modified papaya varieties resistant to their local virus strains.

What happens in Hawaii does not stay in Hawaii, it would seem.
Extent of Sea Ice in Antarctic Breaks July Records

By James M. Taylor

Antarctic sea ice extent broke several records in July. Remarkably, Antarctic sea ice extent had been above the long-term average every day in 2013.

String of New Records
For eight of the final nine days in July, Antarctic sea ice surpassed prior records. The string of records continued into August, with ice coverage setting new records on August 1 and August 2 being the 21st day Antarctic sea ice set a record in 2013.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration satellite instruments have been measuring polar sea ice since 1979. The modest decline in Arctic sea ice since 1979 is almost perfectly matched by the gradual increase in Antarctic sea ice. Combining Arctic and Antarctic sea ice data, total polar sea ice has exceeded the long-term average throughout most of 2013.

Global Perspective Is Necessary
Global warming activists often refer to recent declines in Arctic sea ice in support of their assertion that humans are creating a global warming crisis. However, they routinely neglect to mention the ongoing growth in Antarctic sea ice that largely cancels out the decline in Arctic sea ice.

“The long-term and ongoing growth in Antarctic sea ice is one of the most important yet hidden stories regarding global warming,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Global warming activists like to claim global consequences resulting from carbon dioxide emissions, yet they conveniently forget to discuss the global nature of polar sea ice data.”

JAY LEHR, PH.D.
SCIENCE DIRECTOR
THE HEARTLAND INSTITUTE

“Global warming activists like to claim global consequences resulting from carbon dioxide emissions, yet they conveniently forget to discuss the global nature of polar sea ice data.”

Environment & Climate News

James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Massachusetts AG Coakley Sues NOAA over Fish Limits

By Alyssa Carducci

Massachusetts Attorney General Martha Coakley filed suit in federal district court claiming the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration violated federal law with newly imposed fish-catch restrictions.

Dramatic Reductions in Fish Quotas

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) this spring announced severe cutbacks in the number of cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder New England fisherman can catch this year. NOAA officials said the new restrictions, which reduce the allowable catch by as much as 78 percent, are necessary to replenish fish populations.

“We know that the quota cuts this year for groundfish fishermen for several key stocks, including cod, are severe,” NOAA Northeast Region Administrator John Bullard said in a press statement. “However, given the poor condition of these stocks and the phased approach we took to reducing fishing efforts to help ease the economic impacts on fishermen in 2012, the cuts are necessary.”

‘Death Sentence’ for Area Fishermen

Coakley says NOAA could have safeguarded fish populations with less severe restrictions. She suggested a 40 percent reduction would have protected fish populations while avoiding what she termed a “death sentence” for Massachusetts fishermen.

“NOAA’s new regulations are essentially a death penalty on the fishing industry in Massachusetts as we know it,” said Coakley at a press conference at the Fish Pier in South Boston.

“NOAA’s failure to do its job right is costing the jobs of our fishing families across Massachusetts,” Coakley added.

Possible Violation of Federal Law

At the core of her legal complaint, Coakley claims NOAA’s new restrictions violate the Magnuson-Stevens Act by failing to allow fishermen to catch the optimum yield consistent with sustaining fish populations. She also claims NOAA failed to use the best-available science in determining its fishing quotas and did not consider the economic impacts on regional fishermen.


Fishermen Allege Retaliation

Ferrante said NOAA is imposing draconian fishing restrictions on Massachusetts fishermen in retaliation for local fishermen complaining about recent enforcement of fishing regulations. After the inspector general for the U.S. Department of Commerce investigated the complaints, top NOAA officials in 2010 traveled to Gloucester to personally apologize for NOAA’s excessive actions and repaid some fines collected from area fishermen. Nevertheless, NOAA officials and Massachusetts fishermen continue to spar over what area fishermen say are overly aggressive and retaliatory NOAA actions.

Individual fishermen and small, family fishing enterprises are responsible for most of the catch affected by NOAA’s new restrictions. Earlier this year, area fishermen launched an online petition to close NOAA’s Gloucester office.

“The dirty little secret is that this isn’t about fish. This is about a vindictive agency,” Ferrante said at the Fish Pier press conference.

Climate Scientist Christy Presents Powerful Data

By James M. Taylor

Climate scientist John Christy presented a series of charts and data at a recent scientific conference showing global warming is proceeding at a modest pace and is not causing significant harm.

Christy, a climate scientist at the University of Alabama at Huntsville who oversees the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA) satellite instruments measuring global temperatures, presented records debunking many of the most frequently asserted global warming claims. He made his charts, data, and accompanying explanations available to the public. Links to the charts, data, and accompanying explanations are in the Internet Info sidebar to this story.

Decline in Extreme Weather

Christy’s first chart presented National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) data documenting a long-term decline in the number of powerful tornadoes. Data during the past 50 years show tornado activity peaked in the early 1970s and has been in gradual decline for the past 40 years.

In his second chart, Christy provided tropical storm data since 1970 showing a gradual decline in tropical storm and hurricane activity.

His third chart presented Northern Hemisphere snow cover data showing no trend in snow cover for the past 45 years.

Next, Christy provided NOAA data since the late 1800s showing no trends in drought and extreme wetness.

Christy then presented U.S. Historical Climatology Network data showing no recent increase in the frequency of record-high temperatures. The data showed more high temperature records were set between 1900 and 1955 than between 1955 and 2013.

Too Much Warming Predicted

Next, Christy presented satellite temperature readings showing climate models referenced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicted far more warming during the past 20 years than occurred in the real world.

Finally, Christy presented data showing a 50 percent cut in U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would reduce global temperatures by merely 0.07 degrees Celsius by 2050 and cause little additional reductions after that. An 80 percent reduction in U.S. emissions would not accomplish much more than a 50 percent reduction, Christy showed.

“We are not evil people for emitting CO2, we are good people because we recognize the direct and powerful benefits to human life that carbon-based energy supplies,” Christy summarized.

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

EPA Restrictions Force Carnival out of Baltimore

Carnival Cruise Lines announced plans to pull its Pride cruise ship from the port of Baltimore in the wake of new U.S. Environmental Protection Agency restrictions on cruise ship emissions.

The move, announced June 27, will cost the region millions of dollars in economic activity and hundreds of jobs.

In August 2012, EPA imposed Emission Control Area restrictions on emissions from cruise ships operating off portions of the U.S. coast. Cruise ships will have to purchase expensive low-sulfur fuel to comply with the restrictions.

Maryland port officials estimate the new restrictions will force cruise ships to raise prices up to $140 per passenger for cruises originating in Baltimore. As a result, Carnival and other cruise lines are evaluating options to pull cruise ships from ports subject to the new restrictions.

Carnival’s decision to move its Pride ship to a dock in Tampa, Florida will take effect in November 2014. The Pride, a 2,124-passenger ship, currently sails weekly from Baltimore to the Bahamas and the Caribbean. The city will have just one other operating cruise line, Royal Caribbean’s Grandeur of the Seas.

Jobs, Economic Activity Lost

Richard Scher, spokesperson for the Maryland Port Administration, told Environment & Climate News the two cruise lines produce $90 million in annual economic activity and support about 200 jobs.

“If we lost Carnival and could not replace them, we would lose roughly half of those numbers,” said Scher.

Scher said Baltimore has many qualities attractive to cruise lines. It sits in the third largest U.S. consumer market, it is situated within one of the wealthiest areas in the nation, and the cruise terminal is located right off Interstate 95, the main thoroughfare of the East Coast, he said.

EPA: Cruise Ships Kill Thousands

EPA asserts the new emission restrictions on cruise ships will prevent thousands of premature deaths nationwide and will save millions of dollars in health care costs for treating respiratory problems.

In an attempt to keep the Pride in Baltimore, Carnival offered a compromise where it would spend $200 million over the next three years putting pollution scrubbers on 59 of its ships as they went into dry dock for overhaul.

Scher said the Maryland Port Administration is very supportive of cleaner air and what the new regulations are trying to achieve.

“Many other cruise lines are presenting proposals to the EPA on how they can get in compliance with the new regulations. Once those proposals are approved by the EPA, we feel the Port of Baltimore has a lot of reasons why a cruise line would be successful here,” he said.

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

Oregon Senate Rejects Bill to Extend Clean Fuels Program

Continued from page 1

transportation fuels. In order to meet the standard, motorists will have to purchase more ethanol and biodiesel, each of which is more expensive than conventional transportation fuel and presents its own environmental problems.

The 2009 bill did not require transportation fuel suppliers to make the 10 percent carbon intensity reductions. Fuel suppliers are required only to track and report to the state government the carbon intensity of the fuels they sell.

With just two years remaining to reach the 10 percent goal by 2015, supporters of the program said it requires an extension. Recognizing the problems associated with ratcheting down carbon intensity in so short a time only to waive the restrictions a few months later, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality says it will not enforce the restrictions unless legislators extend or eliminate the 2015 end date for the program.

On July 6 the Oregon Senate rejected SB 488, which would have eliminated the program’s 2015 expiration date. The initial vote was 15–15. Senate Majority Leader Diane Rosenbaum (D-Portland) then changed her vote to oppose the bill, a procedural maneuver that allows her to bring the bill up for a second vote before the end of the legislative session.

Oregonian Opposes Program

If the bill ultimately passes, it will do so despite solid opposition from the capital city’s liberal newspaper, the Portland Oregonian. In a July 26 house editorial, the Oregonian documented appalling abuses of similar clean energy laws in the state, including energy companies gaming the system to extract double and triple subsidies from unsuspecting state taxpayers. Ultimately, according to the Oregonian, the Clean Fuels Program would do little to improve the environment and would instead drive up fuel prices for Oregon motorists.

“The first part of the program, now in effect, imposes tracking and reporting requirements on fuel manufacturers and importers. This is a bureaucratic headache for affected businesses, but the real fun will start with the second part of the program, which requires carbon reduction,” the Oregonian observed.

“The clean fuel program is certainly well-intentioned … but good intentions don’t guarantee good results,” the Oregonian editorial board noted.

“The clean fuels program is nothing if not ambitious. It would be objectionable even if it worked as intended, but that’s about as likely as the development of a cold fusion roadster within the next decade,” the Oregonian explained.

“The decision of lawmakers not to lift the program’s sunset date is an encouraging sign, but Oregonians’ wallets won’t be safe until the clock runs out in late 2015,” the Oregonian concluded.

Alyssa Carducci (ad.carducci@gmail.com) writes from Tampa, Florida.
Washington Ag Dept. Rejects Ban on Pesticide Accused of Bee Decline

By Alyssa Carducci

The Washington State Department of Agriculture rejected a request to ban a garden pesticide that environmental activist groups have attempted to link to declines in the honeybee population.

Bee Decline Factors

Responding to environmental activists’ assertions, Thurston County commissioners asked the Washington Department of Agriculture to ban homeowners from purchasing neonicotinoid pesticides. Those pesticides are commonly used to kill aphids and other insects that attack home garden plants.

Department of Agriculture Director Bud Hover responded in a June 6 letter, pointing out to the county commissioners there is no scientific evidence linking neonicotinoid pesticides to recent declines in honeybee populations.

Instead, scientists link honeybee population declines to a number of factors, including parasites that are in fact controlled by pesticides, plus disease, lack of genetic diversity, and poor nutrition. “The proposed use restrictions are not appropriate at this time,” Hover wrote.

“My bees are on an organic farm where no chemicals are being used, but that doesn’t mean I stop checking for the other things that can kill bees. Nor does having them on an organic farm mean they are going to thrive. Bees can survive a reasonable amount of pressure, but a combination of factors can have an impact. Focusing blame on one thing is misleading and takes our attention away from the real threat.”

TODD MYERS ENVIRONMENTAL DIRECTOR WASHINGTON POLICY CENTER CERTIFIED APPRENTICE BEEKEEPER

Ban Might Have Worsened Decline

Todd Myers, environmental director at the Washington Policy Center, says the Department of Agriculture made a wise decision.

“First, if neonicos are banned, farmers may return to other pesticides that have much higher risk for bees. A ban may, ironically, have been bad for bees,” said Myers.

“Neonicotinoids are pesticides, so they can kill insects—it is what they are designed to do. Neonics, however, are probably less harmful than other types of pesticides and have a smaller impact on bees,” Myers explained.

Multiple Factors in Bee Health

Myers, a certified apprentice beekeeper in Washington, said he watches for many things that may affect his bees, including pesticides, mites, and quality of forage.

“My bees are on an organic farm where no chemicals are being used, but that doesn’t mean I stop checking for the other things that can kill bees. Nor does having them on an organic farm mean they are going to thrive. Bees can survive a reasonable amount of pressure, but a combination of factors can have an impact. Focusing blame on one thing is misleading and takes our attention away from the real threat,” he said.

“Making policy based on bad science leads to bad policy,” Myers added.

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

Global Warming Will Increase Water Availability in Himalayan Watersheds

By James M. Taylor

Water availability in watersheds fed by the Himalayan Mountains will likely increase for at least the duration of the present century, scientists report in the peer-reviewed Nature Geoscience.

Water availability in watersheds fed by the Himalayan Mountains will likely increase for at least the duration of the present century, scientists report in the peer-reviewed Nature Geoscience. The findings debunk claims by global warming activists that global warming is reducing water supplies to more than a billion people in the Indus and Ganges River watersheds.

Data Applied to Climate Models

Walter Immerzeel, a physical geographer at Utrecht University, led a team of scientists who collected glacier runoff data and precipitation data in the Himalayas and the Baltoro and Langtang glaciers. The two glaciers feed the Indus and Ganges rivers, respectively.

After collecting glacier runoff data and precipitation data and applying them to climate models utilized by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the scientists report water availability will increase for at least the duration of the century.

The scientists’ findings apply to the latest generation of climate models utilized by the IPCC. IPCC lead author Hans von Storch reported in a July 2013 interview with the German magazine Der Spiegel that those computer models have predicted more warming than has occurred in the real world, and IPCC will likely have to revise downward its global warming predictions.

Such revisions are likely to further improve the water availability outlook in the Himalayas and the Indus and Ganges River basins.

The newly published study is particularly noteworthy because lead author Immerzeel previously predicted global warming would result in a decrease of water availability in the two river basins. Global warming activists will have to retract alarmist predictions regarding water availability based on Immerzeel’s prior research or explain why Immerzeel’s most up-to-date research is on less solid footing than his prior predictions.

More Precipitation as Planet Warms

As the planet continues a moderate warming in its recovery from the Little Ice Age, the warmer conditions are inducing more evaporation from the world’s oceans, which in turn leads to more precipitation over land masses.

Global precipitation has risen steadily during the past century, leading to an increase in global soil moisture in virtually all measuring stations in the Global Soil Moisture Databank.

In the Himalayas, the enhanced hydrological cycle is resulting in more snowfall in Himalayan mountain ranges where glaciers are fed by moist Indian Ocean air. At lower elevations, more frequent precipitation is reducing dependence on glacial-fed rivers such as the Indus and Ganges.

“This newest study continues a pattern of sound science defeating ‘spaghetti-on-the-wall’ alarmist global warming claims,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Global warming activists issue sensationalist, catastrophic, nonstop predictions about a plethora of alleged global warming impacts, generating a great deal of media publicity in the process, only to have sound science thereafter debunk the claims. They throw as much spaghetti on the wall as possible and count on the media sensationalizing the small amount of spaghetti that sticks on the wall for a small amount of time.

“The truth is global warming is resulting in more frequent rainfall that benefits water-stressed regions. Global warming activists would have people believe that nothing good can come from a modestly warmer planet, but the scientific evidence tells a completely different story,” said Lehr.

James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
Wisconsin DNR Grants Exploratory Permit for Iron Ore Mine

By Bonner R. Cohen

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has opened the regulatory door for a proposed iron ore mine in Iron and Ashland counties by approving a permit for preliminary drilling in the Penokee Range.

The DNR’s action comes four months after Gov. Scott Walker (R) signed a bill making it easier for iron mining companies to clear the state’s regulatory hurdles.

Economic Benefits Predicted

The planned $1.5 billion mine would be developed by Gogebic Taconite (GTAC), a division of Florida-based Cline Resources and Development, which operates coal mines in Appalachian and southern Illinois. The open-pit mine is projected to be in operation for at least 35 years, cover an area of about four miles in northwestern Wisconsin near Lake Superior, and provide 700 direct jobs and an additional 2,800 jobs in trucking, housing, and other industries.

The entrance to the proposed mine is in Ashland County, but actual mining operations will be in Iron County. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rates in Ashland and Iron counties are 10.0 percent and 14.1 percent, respectively.

Walker and other supporters of the mine have gone to great lengths to tout the economic benefits. After signing the iron mining bill in March at a manufacturing plant in Rhinelander, Walker traveled to Milwaukee to P&H Mining Equipment Co. to stress the importance of the mine for job creation throughout the state.

Iron ore is the raw material used to make pig iron, which is essential to the making of steel. Approximately 98 percent of mined iron ore is used to make steel.

Satisfying Environmental Concerns

The DNR permit will allow GTAC to drill eight exploratory holes. The company originally sought to drill 13 holes but scaled back its plans after officials with the DNR and U.S. Army Corp of Engineers visited the site in May. The officials raised concerns that drilling 13 holes would require the company to put heavy equipment on logging roads, posing a threat to adjacent wetlands.

As is common in mining proposals, environmental activists raised concerns about water and mining waste, known as tailings.

GTAC’s exploratory wells will provide valuable data on the amount of pyrite in the rock. When exposed to air or water, pyrite, or waste rock, can cause acid mine damage and potentially harm local surface and groundwater. GTAC officials believe pyrite won’t be a problem at the proposed site and its engineers can manage effectively whatever pyrite-related problems may arise.

Wisconsin Residents Support Mine

Wisconsin residents hope the mine will add to the state’s economic rebound under Walker.

“When MacIver interviewed the residents of Hurley, Wisconsin a year ago for our mini-documentary, ‘Mineshaft,’ it was clear that they desperately want this mine and the family-supporting, generational-changing jobs that go with it,” said Brett Healy, president of the Madison, Wisconsin-based MacIver Institute for Public Policy. “This is an opportunity to dramatically improve the economic fortunes of a downtrodden region for decades to come.

“It is disappointing that extremist environmentalists continue to oppose this job-laden project, and it is even more disgusting that some in their movement will resort to thuggish harassment, theft, and destruction of private property in their attempt to block progress,” Healy added.

“Let’s hope that common sense prevails in the Great North Woods and that GTAC continues to move forward despite the ugliness of the environmental extremists. Wisconsin needs these jobs,” he said.

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

By Jim Lakely

A division of the Chinese Academy of Sciences—the world’s largest science academy, ranked the 12th most influential science organization in the world by *Nature* magazine—in June translated and published a Chinese edition of *Climate Change Reconsidered*, originally published by The Heartland Institute in two volumes in 2009 and 2011.

Historic Moment in the Debate

The book presents a sweeping rebuttal of the findings of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose reports have been widely cited as the basis for taking action to stop or slow the advance of climate change. The IPCC has been surrounded by controversy over editorial bias and lapses in its quality control.

“This is a historic moment in the global debate about climate change,” said Joseph Bast, president of The Heartland Institute, which also publishes *Environment & Climate News*. “The translation and publication of a comprehensive critique of the IPCC’s alarmist reports by a leading national academy of sciences is one more sign of the trend toward skepticism and away from alarmism.”

The new volume represents a collaborative effort among Heartland and some 20 researchers with the Information Center for Global Change Studies and the Scientific Information Center for Resources and Environment of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Bast noted the translation is intended to stimulate academic discussion and promote scientific dialogue in the debate over potential carbon dioxide-induced global climate change.

Authors Speak in Beijing

The English-language volumes were coauthored and edited by Craig D. Idso, Ph.D., chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change; Robert M. Carter, Ph.D., a marine geologist and former research professor at James Cook University in Queensland, Australia; and S. Fred Singer, Ph.D., founder and president of the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP).

On June 15, an international workshop was held in Beijing for Idso, Carter, Singer, and Madhav Khandekar, Ph.D., a former research scientist from Environment Canada who is presently on the editorial board of the *Journal of Natural Hazards* and served as a reviewer for the IPCC’s *Fourth Assessment Report*.

The four also presented their findings at an international symposium held at the Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) in Beijing on June 17. That meeting was organized and chaired by Professor Weihong Cui of the Institute of Remote Sensing and Digital Earth, CAS, and head of NIPCC-China.

A new volume in the *Climate Change Reconsidered* series is being prepared for release this fall, in advance of the IPCC’s expected release of its *Fifth Assessment Report*.

Environmentalists Attack

In the days immediately following Heartland’s June 12 announcement of the Chinese translation, as the authors were in the air on their way to Beijing, there had been some concern the scheduled events would not take place.

Environmental activists had falsely claimed Heartland’s news release stated CAS endorsed the skeptical position on global warming. Those claims led the Chinese to threaten to cancel the scheduled events. Negotiations between Heartland and the Chinese were successful and the events took place as planned.

Heartland had made no such claims of “endorsement” by the Chinese. The English preface of the translated book explains the project was undertaken “to help Chinese researchers understand different points, opinions and positions in debates on climate change.”

Heartland responded to the environmentalists’ attack by reiterating in a statement, “To be clear, the release of this new publication does not imply CAS endorsed the skeptical position.”

From left to right: Professor Weihong Cui, Dr. S. Fred Singer, Dr. Craig D. Idso, Dr. Madhav Khandekar, and Dr. Robert M. Carter in Beijing at the introduction of the Chinese translation of *Climate Change Reconsidered*.

...and any of its affiliates involved with its production ‘endorse’ the skeptical views contained in the report. Rather, as stated in the translator’s preface of the book, ‘The work of these translators, organizations and funders has been in the translation and the promotion of scientific dialogue, does not reflect that they agree with the views of NIPCC.’”

“We are grateful to the Chinese scientists who have helped us make this important research accessible to their countrymen,” said Bast, “and to bloggers and reporters such as those at Breitbart, Watts Up With That, and Science who covered this story accurately.”

Jim Lakely (jlakely@heartland.org) is communications director for The Heartland Institute.

**INTERNET INFO**


California Court Rebuffs Environmental Groups, Approves Solar Project

By Bonner R. Cohen

In the latest clash between renewable energy developers and environmental activists, a California appeals court approved plans to build one of the world’s largest solar power projects about 50 miles south of Silicon Valley.

Environmental Groups Unite

The Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, and a local group known as Save Panoche Valley tried to stop the project, saying the solar farm would harm endangered species such as the San Joaquin kit fox, the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, and the giant kangaroo rat.

A three-judge panel of California’s Sixth District Court of Appeals, however, dismissed environmentalists’ arguments the project should be located elsewhere. The court also rejected their assertions land developers had set aside land of insufficient quality to offset harm to endangered species.

Environmental Offsets Challenged

San Francisco-based PV2 Energy joined forces with North Carolina-based Duke Energy to develop the Panoche Valley solar farm. The $1.8 billion project will have 4 million solar panels spread out over 3,000 acres (just under five square miles) of land.

The San Benito County Board of Supervisors approved the project in 2010, hoping the solar farm would make the predominantly rural county a center for renewable energy.

Environmentalists vow to continue their fight, hoping to bring pressure on the developers to build the project elsewhere.

More Delays Likely

The project is likely to experience further delays. One potential snag is the need for the solar developers to find a utility that will commit to buying the electricity.

The project’s developers are targeting Pacific Gas & Electric, but they’re approaching other utilities as well. Several environmental groups, including the Center for Biological Diversity, are pressuring utilities not to sign contracts for electricity from the planned solar farm.

Another potential source of delay is the need for permits from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Environmental groups, well-schooled in the art of litigation, will likely bring suit against both government entities if they grant permits for the project.

Mandates Drive Development

Renewable power advocates say approval of the project is crucial if California is to meet its 33 percent renewable fuels mandate by 2020.

“California is now faced with the reality of its renewable energy mandate. ... [M]ore conflicts involving endangered species and land conservation will be unavoidable.”

Daniel Simmons
Director of State Policy
Institute for Energy Research

“California is now faced with the reality of its renewable energy mandate,” said Daniel Simmons, director of state policy at the Institute for Energy Research.

“Renewables such as solar power are very land-intensive and, as California tries to achieve its 33 percent renewable power mandate, more conflicts involving endangered species and land conservation will be unavoidable,” Simmons explained.

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

Geothermal Power Plants Are Causing Earthquakes Near San Andreas Fault

By Alyssa Carducci

Geothermal power plants on the southern shore of southern California’s Salton Sea are causing earthquakes in the area, just 12 miles from the San Andreas Fault, according to a newly published peer-reviewed study.

The study could not determine whether the geothermal power plants may one day trigger a larger earthquake along the fault.

30-Year Study Finds Connection

The study, published July 11 in Science, analyzed 30 years of earthquake data since the geothermal power plants began operation in 1982. The study found earthquake activity rose in conjunction with geothermal power production.

From 1981 through 2012, more than 10,000 earthquakes above magnitude 1.75 occurred in the area of the geothermal power plants. The largest quake measured 5.1 on the Richter scale.

The lead author of the study, Emily Brodsky, said it was plausible geothermal power production could trigger a large San Andreas earthquake.

Geothermal power projects extract extremely hot water from deep beneath the Earth’s surface and use it to produce steam to drive electricity-producing turbines. Power plant operators inject the remaining brine back underground.

Assessing the Risks

William Ellsworth, a geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey office in Menlo Park, says it is long-settled science that geothermal energy production can cause earthquakes. In fact, Ellsworth said, the earthquakes are a necessary component of continuing geothermal power production. Without the small earthquakes, the geothermal field would close up.

Ellsworth said large earthquakes can sometimes begin on smaller, nearby faults and then jump to the main fault. He said that is how the 2002 magnitude 7.9 Denali Fault earthquake began in Alaska. The initiating event in that case was sizeable, over magnitude 6, he said.

“Could much smaller earthquakes off of the San Andreas fault trigger a large San Andreas Fault earthquake? Yes. How likely is this to happen? This is an active area of research,” said Ellsworth. “However, it is very unlikely that any particular earthquake will trigger the big one, as tens of thousands of [small earthquakes] happen in California every year and the last major San Andreas Fault earthquake was over 100 years ago in 1906.”

Ellsworth said studies of geothermal power plants along the San Andreas Fault in northern California also show the plants trigger earthquakes, but none of the earthquakes triggered a larger quake along the San Andreas Fault.

“Studies of geothermally induced earthquakes at The Geysers in northern California do not show any evidence for triggering of earthquakes on nearby faults of the San Andreas Fault system,” Ellsworth said.

Alyssa Carducci (ad.carducci@gmail.com) writes from Tampa, Florida.
Experts Contradict Obama on Climate Change Claim

By James M. Taylor

Expert witnesses called by Sen. Barbara Boxer to testify during Senate Environment and Public Works hearings contradicted a key assertion made by President Barack Obama on climate change.

‘No Patience’ for Dissent

Speaking at a Democratic fundraiser less than a month before directing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to impose costly new restrictions on carbon dioxide emissions, Obama said, “We also know that the climate is warming faster than anybody anticipated five or 10 years ago.”

“I don’t have much patience for people who deny climate change,” Obama added.

Expert Witnesses Dissent

During the July 18 Senate Environment and Public Works hearings, Sen. David Vitter (R-LA) asked a panel of experts, including experts selected by California Democrat Boxer, “Can any witnesses say they agree with Obama’s statement that warming has accelerated during the past 10 years?”

For several seconds, nobody said a word. After the period of silence, Weather Channel meteorologist and global warming activist Heidi Cullen attempted to change the subject, saying the focus should be on longer time periods rather than the 10-year period mentioned by Obama. When pressed, however, she contradicted Obama’s central assertion and said warming has slowed, not accelerated.

Several minutes later, Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL) returned to the topic and sought further clarity. Sessions recited Obama’s quote claiming accelerating global warming during the past 10 years and asked, “Do any of you support that quote?”

Again, a prolonged silence ensued. Neither Cullen nor any of the other experts on the panel spoke a word, not even in an attempt to change the subject.

Sessions Debunks Cullen’s Claims

Cullen added to Boxer and Obama’s embarrassment by making demonstrably false or misleading statements as focal points of her testimony.

Cullen claimed global warming is causing an increase in wildfires. Sessions responded with a chart showing the number of U.S. wildfires is in long-term decline. Although the number of total acres burned may have increased, that is due to a recent change in government fire policy that no longer aims to extinguish fires immediately after they begin.

Cullen also claimed global warming is causing more extreme heat, but Sessions presented a chart showing no increase in daily high temperature records. U.S. daily high temperature records were set more frequently during the first half of the twentieth century, Sessions’ chart showed.

Cullen also claimed global warming is causing more drought, and Sessions presented a chart showing no long-term increase in drought in the United States. Globally, scientific data and peer-reviewed studies show a long-term increase in global soil moisture, resulting in less-frequent and less-severe drought.

Cullen claimed global warming is causing a decrease in snow coverage. Rutgers University Global Snow Lab data over the past 45 years show Northern Hemisphere snow extent is experiencing a long-term increase, not decrease.

Cullen finally claimed global warming was a major factor producing “Hurricane Sandy” and its negative impacts. Sessions presented a chart showing there has been no long-term increase in hurricanes. The U.S. Northeast experienced more hurricane activity during the first half of the twentieth century, when human carbon dioxide emissions were relatively minor, than in the 60-plus years since.

Pielke Addresses Extreme Weather

Roger Pielke, Jr., professor of environmental sciences at the University of Colorado, ... [testified] that global warming is not causing more-frequent and more-severe weather events.”

“Roger Pielke, Jr., professor of environmental sciences at the University of Colorado, ... [testified] that global warming is not causing more-frequent and more-severe weather events.”

Again, a prolonged silence ensued. Neither Cullen nor any of the other experts on the panel spoke a word, not even in an attempt to change the subject.

Sessions Debunks Cullen’s Claims

Cullen added to Boxer and Obama’s embarrassment by making demonstrably false or misleading statements as focal points of her testimony.

Cullen claimed global warming is causing an increase in wildfires. Sessions responded with a chart showing the number of U.S. wildfires is in long-term decline. Although the number of total acres burned may have increased, that is due to a recent change in government fire policy that no longer aims to extinguish fires immediately after they begin.

Cullen also claimed global warming is causing more extreme heat, but Sessions presented a chart showing no increase in daily high temperature records. U.S. daily high temperature records were set more frequently during the first half of the twentieth century, Sessions’ chart showed.

Cullen also claimed global warming is causing more drought, and Sessions presented a chart showing no long-term increase in drought in the United States. Globally, scientific data and peer-reviewed studies show a long-term increase in global soil moisture, resulting in less-frequent and less-severe drought.

Cullen claimed global warming is causing a decrease in snow coverage. Rutgers University Global Snow Lab data over the past 45 years show Northern Hemisphere snow extent is experiencing a long-term increase, not decrease.

Cullen finally claimed global warming was a major factor producing “Hurricane Sandy” and its negative impacts. Sessions presented a chart showing there has been no long-term increase in hurricanes. The U.S. Northeast experienced more hurricane activity during the first half of the twentieth century, when human carbon dioxide emissions were relatively minor, than in the 60-plus years since.

Pielke Addresses Extreme Weather

Roger Pielke, Jr., professor of environmental sciences at the University of Colorado, added weight to Sessions’ arguments by normal weather events.

Sessions charted tropical mid-troposphere temperature predictions of 73 climate models and showed all 73 predicted more warming than actually occurred. Tropical mid-troposphere temperatures are especially important because this is where human-caused global warming is expected to leave its most visible fingerprint.

Spencer also showed global warming across the planet has occurred at only half the pace predicted by U.N. computer models.

Applying real-world observations to climate model predictions, Spencer demonstrated a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide would cause only about 1.3 degrees Celsius of global warming. That modest amount of warming would not create a crisis, Spencer noted.

Boxer’s Hearings Backfire

Boxer likely envisioned her high-profile global warming hearings as an opportunity to build momentum for congressional or EPA action to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. Instead, her witnesses made claims that were easily debunked by real-world scientific evidence.

At the same time, Boxer gave scientists such as Pielke and Spencer a visible platform to explain why humans are not causing a global warming crisis.
Public Overwhelmingly Opposes Carbon Tax

By Kenneth Artz

American voters overwhelmingly oppose a carbon tax, according to a survey released by the Institute for Energy Research.

Only 35 Percent Support

According to the survey of 800 registered voters, 35 percent favor and 59 percent oppose a carbon tax. Democrats generally support a carbon tax (54 percent to 39 percent), while Republicans and independents strongly oppose the idea (80 percent to 16 percent and 62 percent to 29 percent, respectively).

Just 33 percent of respondents said they would be more likely to vote for a member of Congress who votes for a carbon tax, whereas 50 percent said they would be less likely to vote for a member of Congress who did so.

Suspicious of Motives

American voters are particularly suspicious of carbon tax supporters’ motivation. Only 34 percent say they believe improving the environment is the primary motivation behind a carbon tax, whereas 61 percent say carbon tax supporters are primarily interested in raising more money for government.

Even among respondents who support a carbon tax, many want only a very small tax. Only 20 percent of all respondents would support paying $100 or more per year in a carbon tax.

On a broader subject, 79 percent said Congress should focus more on the economy, versus only 17 percent who said Congress should focus more on the environment.

Sterling Burnett, a senior fellow with the National Center for Policy Analysis, said he is not surprised at the overwhelming opposition to a carbon tax.

“A certain portion of Americans might be willing to pay carbon taxes if they would do any good, but no one has proven that a carbon tax will do anything to mitigate global warming,” Burnett said.

Strong Message to Pols

Daniel Simmons, director of regulatory and state affairs at the Institute for Energy Research, says beltway politicians can learn much from the survey.

“The takeaway is that American voters are not in favor of increased taxes or higher prices for energy and are very willing to vote against their congressmen who vote in favor of a carbon tax.”

Daniel Simmons, Director
Regulatory and State Affairs
Institute for Energy Research

Kenneth Artz (iamkenartz@hotmail.com) writes from Dallas, Texas.
Fracking Brings Employment and Economic Revival

By Paul Driessen

Signs of pride and prosperity were evident all over Williamsport and the gorgeous northern Pennsylvania countryside around it. Friendly, happy people greeted us. New cars, trucks, hotels, and restaurants sparkled in a clean, bustling downtown. New roofs topped barns and houses, while late-model tractors worked the fields. Formerly dirt roads are now paved.

Men and women again have high-paying jobs, young people are coming back instead of moving away, their salaries are supporting other businesses and jobs, and many are taking college programs in oilfield technical and business specialties, Vince Matteo told me. As president and CEO of the Williamsport/Lycoming County Chamber of Commerce, he has witnessed the transformation.

“Ninety-eight percent of the change has been positive,” he said. Contributions to United Way are increasing each year, county infrastructure has improved enormously, and environmental impacts are minimal.

Productive, Green Technologies

Visits to several Anadarko Petroleum drilling and fracking sites explained why. Steadily improved fracturing technology is now combined with computers, down-hole sensors, and microseismic instruments. Drilling equipment lets crews send a bit 6,000 feet down and 8,000 feet laterally into Marcellus Shale formations, and end up within three feet of their intended target.

The operations are conducted from atop a multilayered felt and impermeable plastic pad, surrounded by a berm, to keep unlikely spills from contaminating farm and forest land. Multiple wells are drilled from a single pad and “kicked out” horizontally in various directions.

A nearby impoundment is also lined with plastic to hold water for fracturing operations. Topsoil removed to prepare the pad and pond is stored nearby. As operations are finished, the land is reclaimed, topsoil is replaced, and local grasses, flowers, and shrubs are planted, to create meadows for deer and wild turkeys—or anything else the landowners prefer.

Once the work is completed, the area quietly and unobtrusively produces decades of energy—and revenue for farmers, wildlife organizations, hunting groups, and local, state, and federal treasuries.

Hydraulic fracturing takes place some 5,500 feet—almost four Empire State Buildings—below the water table. To prevent groundwater contamination, the pipe penetrating the first 700 feet is surrounded by layers of steel casing and specialized cement. During the drilling and fracturing process, even rainwater collected from the drill pad is saved and used. Some of the water used to fracture the shale is also recovered during gas production, and this “flowback” water itself is filtered, treated, and reused.

Water Consumption Overhyped

The Environmental Protection Agency says fracturing consumes 70 billion to 140 billion gallons a year nationally, and the Texas Water Resources Board (TWRB) estimates Lone Star State oil and natural gas companies used 27 billion gallons of water for fracturing statewide in 2011.

But Texas homeowners used 495 billion gallons for lawns and gardens, the TWRB found—18 times what fracturing consumed—and household landscape irrigation nationwide consumes nearly 3 trillion gallons of water annually, according to EPA.

Even more revealing, according to the U.S. Department of Energy, fracturing requires just 0.6 to 5.8 gallons of water per million Btus of energy produced. By comparison, “renewable” and “sustainable” corn-based ethanol requires 2,510 to 29,100 gallons per million Btus of usable energy, and biodiesel from soybeans consumes an astounding and unsustainable 14,000 to 75,000 gallons of water per million Btus.

Fracking has never contaminated water supplies. Fracturing fluids are 99.5% water and sand, and the 0.5% chemicals portion is increasingly basic, nontoxic household or kitchen stuff. Anadarko’s chemicals today are only “slickeners,” to help the sand get further into cracks created by the pressurized water, and “biocides” that prevent bacterial buildup in the well pipes. Every EPA, Department of Energy, and other study conducted to date has concluded fracking has never contaminated a single U.S. well.

Revitalized Economies

Hydraulic fracturing has created 1.7 million new direct and indirect jobs in the United States, with the total likely to rise to 3 million over the next seven years, IHS Global Insight reports. It has added $62 billion to federal and state treasuries, with that total expected to rise to $111 billion by 2020. By 2035, U.S. oil and natural gas operations could provide more than $5 trillion in cumulative capital expenditures to the economy, while generating more than $2.5 trillion in cumulative additional government revenues.

This game-changing technology has transformed global political equations and power structures. With the United States sitting atop centuries’ worth of now-economically producible oil and natural gas, OPEC and Russia can no longer control prices.

Hollywood Hype

Why, then, do Hollywood and radical greens celebrate misleading films like Gasland and Promised Land, even after Phelim McAleen and Ann McElhinney’s documentary FrackNation completely demolished Gasland’s lies and distortions? Why do activists such as Food and Water Watch and the Sierra Club and ill-informed celebrities such as Yoko Ono continue to scream hysterical nonsense about the process?

Follow the money—and the ideology. FrackNation plausibly suggests Russia is putting big money into U.S. activist groups to stop them from threatening OPEC’s market share. Big Eco is big business, and big egos. It seeks ever-more power and ever-greater control over our lives. Fracking threatens all of that.

These shameful attitudes hurt people and the planet. We need to frack for a better, cleaner, happier world.

Paul Driessen (pkdriessen@gmail.com) is senior policy advisor for the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power—Black Death. A shorter version of this article first appeared at Townhall.com. Reprinted with permission.
**N.J. Legislature OKs Logging in Forest Bill**

By Alyssa Carducci

The New Jersey legislature overwhelmingly passed a Democrat-sponsored forest stewardship bill that will allow targeted logging in state forests.

The bill’s supporters say targeted logging will help restore forests to a more natural condition after decades of aggressive fire suppression have unwittingly created conditions that make fires more likely. Gov. Chris Christie (R) has yet to sign or veto the bill.

The New Jersey Senate passed the bill by a 36–3 vote. The Assembly then passed it by a 46–27 vote.

**Democrats Propose Logging**

The bill, first introduced by state Sens. John McKeon (D-Morris), Paul Moriarty (D-Gloucester), Donald Norcross (D-Camden), and Bob Smith (D-Middlesex), directs the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to create forest management plans for forests on state-owned lands that do not have such plans. The plan must comply with standards promulgated by the nonprofit Forest Stewardship Council.

The language of the bill allows targeted logging as a forest stewardship strategy, and the bill’s Democratic sponsors made it clear they consider targeted logging a necessary component of wise stewardship for many state-owned forest lands.

The envisioned stewardship plans are expected to cost approximately $2.7 million, but fees paid by logging companies will likely cover the cost.

**Fine-Tuned for Environmental Support**

McKeon made several changes to the bill’s initial language in response to concerns voiced by various environmental activist groups. Most importantly for environmental activists, he added the language ensuring forest stewardship plans comply with Forest Stewardship Council standards.

The New Jersey Conservation Foundation, Audubon Society, Highlands Coalition, Pinelands Preservation Alliance, and New Jersey Farm Bureau supported the final bill. The Sierra Club and Environment New Jersey opposed it.

“Our long-time, well-intentioned strategy of putting out all forest fires—natural or manmade—as soon as possible has resulted in unnatural forest conditions,” said Jay Lehr, science director for The Heartland Institute, which publishes Environment & Climate News. “Forest lands are overcrowded, especially with too much undergrowth, as fire and forestry officials prevent forest fires from playing their important role in ecosystem management. This bill attempts to restore New Jersey forests to their more-natural conditions.

“What is most striking about this debate is the extremist position taken by the Sierra Club and Environment New Jersey,” Lehr added. “[A] certain number of environmental extremists would rather see forests and wildlife suffer than allow ‘evil’ logging companies to obtain work doing an important public service.”

JAY LEHR, PH.D. SCIENCE DIRECTOR THE HEARTLAND INSTITUTE

“Atheir Democratic legislative allies wrote the bill, a slew of environmental groups recognize the benefits of the bill, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection supports it, and the bill requires all forest management activities to comply with the Forest Stewardship Council. For a certain number of environmental extremists, they would rather see forests and wildlife suffer than allow ‘evil’ logging companies to obtain work doing an important public service.”

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

**Florida Water Managers May Sell Some State Land**

Continued from page 1

Federal, state, and local governments own nearly 30 percent of the land in Florida. Scott’s directive is designed to restore private property rights and reduce the amount of taxpayer dollars spent to manage so much government land.

Initially, SFWMD will assess what to do with half its holdings, or 750,000 acres. The district expects to hold on to most of its properties but knows certain tracts are likely to wind up for sale.

Most likely to go on the market are isolated tracts, typically a few hundred acres in size, that aren’t contiguous to larger conservation or restoration areas managed by the district.

**Government Owns 30 Percent**

Bob McClure, president and CEO of the James Madison Institute, a Florida-based public policy organization, says state officials could have more efficiently cared for government-owned lands by working more cooperatively with private land management companies.

“It is commonly understood that the State of Florida lacks the time and resources to properly manage all the land in its care,” said McClure. “The state uses private services in a multitude of areas. One option could be to privatize the management of its land holdings such that they are protected and preserved for effective use, while being mindful of the best interest for the short- and long-term needs of the state.”

The process of state officials deciding what lands to hold on to and what lands to dispose of will take time. Before any land is put up for bids, there will be further evaluations, appraisals, public comment, and approval from the agency’s governing board.

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

By Steve Goreham

Climate science is in turmoil. Contrary to predictions by the world’s leading climate models and despite rising levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide, global surface temperatures have been flat for 16 years. How can it be that the climate models are wrong?

Cooler Revisions Necessary

Last October, the U.K. Daily Mail announced temperature data from the U.K. Meteorological Office showed no global warming for 16 years. In December, an advance chart from the upcoming Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change showed a divergence between model projections and actual global temperatures. In January of this year, the Met Office revised its forecast of temperatures down to almost no increase over the next five years.

Media publications that have been staunch supporters of the theory of manmade climate change have noted the model failure. In March, The Economist stated, “The climate may be heating up in response to greenhouse gases less than was once thought.” The New York Times noted in June that the temperature slowdown “is a bit of a mystery to climate scientists.”

All major climate models have overestimated the effects of manmade warming. Analysis by Roy Spencer, Ph.D., and John Christy, Ph.D., shows 44 of the world’s leading climate models projected an average temperature rise of about 0.5°C during the past 16 years when measured temperatures were flat. The analysis was recently updated to include 73 of the leading climate models. Not a single model made an accurate forecast.

Speculative Feedbacks Absent

In any reasonable scenario, carbon dioxide can’t cause catastrophic global warming by itself. This is because the absorption of infrared radiation by CO2 is non-linear. The first 20 parts per million of CO2 in our atmosphere account for about one-half of the greenhouse warming from CO2. Adding more carbon dioxide has a diminishing warming effect. Doubling atmospheric CO2 from 280 ppm to 560 ppm, whether from natural or manmade causes, would by itself increase Earth’s surface temperature by only about 1.2°C.

So how do the climate models reach their alarming conclusions? They assume positive feedback from water vapor will cause additional warming. The argument is that, since warmer air can hold more moisture, water vapor will increase in the atmosphere as the Earth warms. Since water vapor is a greenhouse gas, additional water vapor will add additional warming to that caused by CO2.

The assumption of positive feedback from water vapor has been integral to the climate models since the 1960s, when Syukuro Manabe developed one of the first models. As part of his model, he assumed global relative humidity remained constant as the atmosphere heated up. This meant the atmosphere would hold increasing amounts of water vapor, adding more greenhouse heating to that of carbon dioxide.

However, satellite data show atmospheric water vapor to have been relatively constant over the past 30 years. In addition, peer-reviewed papers by Lindzen and Choi (2011) and Spencer and Braswell (2010) show climate system feedbacks are likely to be low or even negative. Rather than adding to the warming, water vapor and clouds may even act to reduce warming from rising atmospheric CO2.

Natural Factors Drive Climate

It appears the models have relied on a “flea wagging the dog” assumption. Forces driving Earth’s water cycle, which includes weather and the oceans, are many orders of magnitude more powerful than the ebb and flow of carbon dioxide into our atmosphere. A large hurricane releases heat energy at a rate of one exploding 10-megaton nuclear bomb every 20 minutes. The idea that the atmospheric level of CO2, a trace gas, is controlling weather and the water cycle is improbable. The idea that mankind’s relatively tiny CO2 emissions impact the water cycle is preposterous.

As Roy Spencer pointed out in his recent congressional testimony, U.S. policies to fight climate change are based on failed climate model projections. Do you suppose we should rethink our misguided war on climate change?

Steve Goreham (steve@climatism.net) is executive director of the Climate Science Coalition of America and author of the new book The Mad, Mad, Mad World of Climatism: Mankind and Climate Change Mania. This article first appeared in the Washington Times and is reprinted with permission.
Global Warming Alarmism Memorably Debunked

Review by Jay Lehr, Ph.D.

A
uthor Joe Fone of Christchurch, New Zealand has spent many years researching current and historical data on climate change, with the help of the finest scientists down under. His new book, Climate Change: Natural or Manmade? gives a clear, unbiased view of what is reasonably true and what is clearly incorrect. The book shows his strong intellect and unrestricted effort to find the truth wherever it lay.

Alarmism Devoid of Science

Fone really won me over with Chapter 2, titled “Sagan’s Problem Planet,” where he describes Carl Sagan as a science populist rather than the great astronomer of public myth. I have taken Sagan to task on a wide variety of subjects, but Fone usefully concentrates on Sagan’s theories about the atmosphere of Venus, which Sagan used to support his belief in anthropogenic global warming.

Fone accurately calls global warming today’s cause célèbre, “promoted by an army of enthusiasts from scientists and politicians to environmentalists, celebrities and now even theologians, all of whom declare it to be the most pressing issue facing us since the last such scare—the 1970s ice age panic promoted by a similar army.”

Fone aptly describes the global warming movement as a juggernaut of unprecedented proportions, an unstoppable monster threatening to engulf every facet of our lives.

From there, he mounts an impressive 250-year history of the semi-scientific issues that led to the possibility the world might eventually be held hostage by a truly unprovable theory.

First among these issues was the belief in a solar constant, which removed from the equation the reality that solar variance is a major player in the Earth’s climate. Fone also provides an excellent analysis of what glaciers have taught us regarding the causes and effects of natural climate fluctuations.

Shortsighted Politics

Fone’s uncovering of the scientific errors that led to and supported the mythical global warming crisis is as detailed as any you will find. The documentation of such scientific errors will be especially interesting to the scientifically trained reader. Fone provides a compelling narrative of how even Margaret Thatcher, the sharp, conservative former British prime minister, bought into the false global warming crisis. In the early 1980s, Thatcher’s government was beset by union-led coal mine strikes. Thatcher saw an opportunity to undermine the miners and their exceptional demands by joining forces with the global warming alarmists calling for less coal power and more nuclear power.

Thatcher’s plan resulted in a short-term political victory over the coal miners’ union, but at the long-term price of rendering Great Britain subject to economically punishing and scientifically unjustified global warming extremism.

Thatcher bought into global warming alarmism for more than 10 years before recognizing that joining forces with socialist environmental activists who sought to dismantle market economies was a big mistake. By then, however, it was far too late to undo the damage she had done.

Shortcomings in IPCC Models

Getting back to the science, Fone adeptly explains the important role clouds play in changing climate conditions.

By their very nature, clouds present extremely complex problems to climate modelers. Despite such complex uncertainties, climate modelers with the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) always assume clouds will serve as a positive feedback mechanism, amplifying any global warming caused by rising atmospheric carbon dioxide levels.

Fone demonstrates the faultiness of that assumption, quoting Princeton University physicist Freeman Dyson, who pointed out the failure of IPCC’s climate model assumptions. Fone also quotes dozens of additional climatologists meticulously tearing apart the IPCC models.

Debunking Other Myths

One of Fone’s most interesting assessments is his discussion of tipping points. Global warming activists often claim our planet is approaching a tipping point that will cause a rapid acceleration of global warming and global warming impacts. Those activists seek to create a sense of fear by selling the idea that we are fast reaching a point of no return where we have sealed our collective doom.

Fone presents the overwhelming verdict of science that no such tipping points are likely in the foreseeable future. To the extent future warming may occur, it is likely to continue at its present modest pace. Such modest warming continues to provide net human welfare benefits rather than overall harm.

Fone also does a superb job of debunking the myth that scientists have reached a consensus that humans are creating a global warming crisis. To the extent some scientists claim a consensus exists, they are merely parroting a predetermined agenda. Memorably, Fone quotes MIT atmospheric scientist Richard Lindzen saying, “A consensus was reached before the research had even begun.”

The science presented to support global warming alarmism, Fone says, was convincingly debunked well before the formation of the IPCC, even before the Thatcher government poisoned the political well with her brief but damaging alliance with global warming alarmists.

Sadly, it was political intervention that encouraged some agenda-driven scientists to manipulate the evidence to support their political masters, who then rewarded them with lucrative research grants. This created the foundations of a corrupt, self-sustaining industry driven by politics and money.

Fone presents a compelling narrative of why the mythical human-caused global warming crisis is a dangerous illusion. I highly recommend this book.

Jay Lehr, Ph.D. (jlehr@heartland.org) is science director of The Heartland Institute.
Obama’s Climate Plan: Allow Turbines to Kill Millions of Birds and Bats

By James M. Taylor

A newly published peer-reviewed study reports U.S. wind turbines kill 1.4 million birds and bats every year, even while producing just 3 percent of U.S. electricity.

The numbers in the study from Wildlife Society Bulletin reveal President Barack Obama’s global warming plan will kill hundreds of millions of birds and bats while doing little if anything to reduce global temperatures.

Birds Killed by the Millions

Global warming alarmists say we must reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 50 or even 80 percent. Obama’s recently announced assault on climate change appears likely to seek such numbers.

Even if no new wind turbines are ever built, turbine blades will slice 14 million birds and bats to death in midflight during the next decade. But given that most global warming alarmists vigorously oppose hydropower, natural gas power, and nuclear power, reducing emissions by 50 to 80 percent would require increasing the number of wind turbines roughly 25-fold. That means killing 350 million birds and bats in the United States every decade.

The number of bird and bat deaths likely would be much higher than that. Wind turbines produce power on an intermittent and unpredictable basis, meaning conventional power plants must remain cycling constantly to fill minute-by-minute fluctuations in wind power. That means electricity produced by wind turbines is far from carbon-neutral.

Moreover, wind power companies already have cherry-picked the best locations to place turbines. As wind power companies are forced to build their industrial wind farms on less-productive sites, each new wind turbine and wind farm will produce less electricity than its predecessors.

Accordingly, producing 25 times as much wind power means building a heck of a lot more than 25 times more wind turbines.

Pushed Toward Extinction

Looking at the direct consequences of all these new wind turbines, it is difficult to visualize so many bird and bat deaths. After all, 350 million is a huge number. And that is not a one-time number. That is the number of birds and bats that wind turbines would kill every decade.

How would bird and bat populations be able to sustain themselves under such an onslaught? Most bird and bat populations likely could not, and Obama’s climate plan would initiate an open-ended avian destruction the likes of which we have never seen.

Bald eagles, California condors, and whooping cranes would be among the first to go. But it wouldn’t be just endangered and threatened species that would fail to sustain their numbers. Pretty much every kind of bird you can think of would race precipitously toward unsustainability, with many facing a very real threat of extinction.

Bat populations also would be decimated. Bats are already in rapid decline due to white-nose syndrome, a cold-loving fungus that is affecting bat populations in the U.S. Northeast and spreading westward across the country.

Bat populations in the Northeast have declined by approximately 80 percent, and the 888,000 bat kills resulting from wind turbines each year aren’t helping the cause. Ramp up the number of wind turbines and you ramp up the pressure on declining bat populations.

Far-Reaching Negative Consequences

Killing so many birds and bats every year would have profound negative consequences beyond the mere deaths of birds and bats. Birds and bats are vital in keeping insect populations in check.

Kill as many birds and bats as Obama’s climate plan would do, and mosquito-borne diseases will assault Americans with striking ferocity. Crops will suffer under a growing onslaught of insect attack. Farmers will have to employ more and stronger pesticides to secure our food production.

With wind turbines killing so many birds of prey, infestations of rats and other vermin also will become more frequent and severe.

In addition, wind turbines require vast amounts of land to produce even a small amount of electricity. Even under optimum conditions, it takes approximately 400 square miles of land to produce as much electricity as a conventional power plant. Ramp up wind power production to replace conventional power plants and watch America’s remaining open spaces turn into whirring killing fields.

Little Justification for Turbines

If global warming actually threatened to destroy the planet, perhaps we would have to sacrifice birds and bats for the cause. But the reality is just the opposite.

United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) lead author Hans von Storch conceded in July that computer models predicting significant future global warming cannot replicate recent temperatures and likely need to be adjusted downward to predict less warming. Hurricanes, tornados, droughts, and wildfires are all in long-term downward trends as our planet modestly warms in its recovery from the recent Little Ice Age.

Finally, sacrificing hundreds of millions of birds and bats would do nothing to moderate global temperatures. Even if the United States immediately cut emissions by 80 percent, new growth in Chinese emissions would render our reductions useless in less than a decade.

President Obama, you can have your global warming plan. We’ll keep our wildlife and our undeveloped lands.

James M. Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is managing editor of Environment & Climate News.
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It’s Time to Restore EPA’s Original Purpose

By Jay Lehr, Ph.D.

In 1968, when I was serving as the head of a groundwater professional society, it became obvious to me and some of my colleagues that the United States did not have any serious focus on potential problems with air quality, drinking water quality, surface water quality, waste disposal problems, and contamination that could occur from mining and agriculture. I held the nation’s first Ph.D. in groundwater hydrology, which gave me unparalleled insight into many of these potential problems.

We spoke before dozens of congressional committees, calling attention to mounting environmental pollution problems. We called for the establishment of a federal Environmental Protection Agency, and in 1971 we succeeded. I was appointed to a variety of the new agency’s advisory councils, and over the next 10 years we helped write a variety of legislative bills to establish a true safety net for our environment. These included, among others, the Water Pollution Control Act (later renamed the Clean Water Act); the Safe Drinking Water Act; the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act; the Clean Air Act; the Federal Insecticide, Rodenticide, and Fungicide Act; and the Comprehensive Environmental Reclamation, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

All of these laws worked well in protecting the environment and our citizens’ health, with the exception of CERCLA, better known as Superfund, which proved to be far too overreaching.

A turning point occurred roughly a decade after the creation of EPA. Activist groups realized the agency could be used to alter our government by coming down heavily on all human activities regardless of their impact on the environment.

From approximately 1981 onward, EPA rules and regulations became less about science-based environmental protection and more about advancing extraneous ideological agendas.

States Ready

It is my very strong belief that most EPA jurisdiction and functions can and should be replaced by a committee of the whole of the 50 state environmental protection agencies.

Each of the individual states has its own environmental protection department, and these are much better at assessing and crafting solutions to local and regional environmental issues than the federal EPA. At the national level, a committee of the whole would do a much better job directing environmental stewardship than the money-hungry and power-hungry federal EPA.

Back in 1971, a federal EPA was necessary because the states did not have environmental protection departments. Now, however, with state departments already providing on-the-ground environmental protection throughout the 50 states, EPA has morphed into an overpowering entity that arrogantly dictates to the 50 states while doing everything possible to protect its power and regulatory turf.

The 50 state agencies are ready to assume full management of our environmental issues. Many states already enact and enforce environmental rules more stringent than those crafted by EPA. Only the EPA research laboratories should be left in place to answer scientific questions, no longer under the heavy hand of Washington politics.

Workable Phase-Out Plan

We could eliminate 80 percent of EPA’s bloated $8 billion budget and return the money to the people. The remaining 20 percent could be used to fund EPA’s research labs and pull together a committee of the 50 state environmental protection departments to take over EPA’s other responsibilities.

A relatively small administrative structure is all that is necessary to enable the states to work together. The states would have the incentive and the means to act as environmental stewards without the power to impose scientifically unjustified, economically punitive restrictions on a national basis.

We could phase out EPA in five years. It would take one year to prepare the new structure and then four years to phase out the various EPA bureaus and programs. As each EPA program is phased out, the committee of the whole would assume the phased-out oversight and responsibilities.

Committee of the Whole Responsibilities

The committee of the whole would determine which regulations are actually mandated in law by Congress and which were crafted under EPA discretion. The committee then would reassess discretionary regulations to ensure wise ones are retained and unwise strictures are revised or repealed. A good procedure for reviewing EPA regulations would require a two-thirds vote of the committee of the whole to revise or repeal an existing EPA regulation.

Environmental stewardship would continue unabated, but without the severe negative consequences resulting from EPA arrogance and overreach.

Until and unless the committee of the whole acts upon an existing regulation, each regulation would remain in force. All existing environmental rules and regulations would be presumed wise and valid unless the states determine otherwise.

When one considers the initial motivation for creating a federal EPA, a 50-state committee of the whole makes perfect sense as a forward-looking means of ensuring wise and appropriate environmental stewardship. The states are today in the best position to assess and address environmental concerns within their respective borders, and a committee of the whole can effectively address environmental issues that are regional or national in nature.

The easy path is the path of least resistance. The easy path is to continue funding and granting increasing power to an out-of-control federal EPA. A wiser path is to recognize that the individual states are ready and willing to provide more common-sense environmental protection.

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

“"It is my very strong belief that most EPA jurisdiction and functions can and should be replaced by a committee of the whole of the 50 state environmental protection agencies."
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**JULY 2013**

**GLOBAL AVERAGE**

The global average temperature for July was 0.17°C above normal.

**NORTHERN HEMISPHERE**

The Northern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.14°C above normal.

**SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE**

The Southern Hemisphere's temperature was 0.21°C above normal.

**219,000 years of Temperature Variation**
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