

The Week That Was: 2011-07-09 (July 9, 2011) Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org) The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the SEPP web site: www.sepp.org.

#####

Good News! Fred Singer will be spreading the joyous news that humanity and the environment do not face eminent destruction. The claim of unprecedented and dangerous global warming is scientifically false.

Fred's tentative itinerary includes talks at the following times and locations:

July 14: **Oakland**, CA, Lunch at the Independent Institute. Reserve tickets at <http://www.independent.org/events/>

July 15, **Los Alamos**, NM, At Masa Library 11:30 am to 1:30 pm

July 16, **Albuquerque**, NM, at 8 am, at the conference of the Doctors for Disaster Preparedness (requires registration)

July 18, **Fort Collins**, CO, at 7:30 pm during a general meeting at Glover Hall, Colorado State University, (technical meeting at 3 pm)

July 19, **Boulder**, CO, at 4 pm at NIST, 345 Broadway

For details please contact Ken@sepp.org

#####

Quote of the Week:

The world looks with some awe upon a man who appears unconcernedly indifferent to home, money, comfort, rank, or even power and fame. The world feels not without a certain apprehension, that here is someone outside its jurisdiction; someone before whom its allurements may be spread in vain; someone strangely enfranchised, untamed, untrammelled by convention, moving independent of the ordinary currents of human action. Winston Churchill, politician and statesman (1874-1965)

#####

Number of the Week: 34,000 premature deaths per year

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

Videos from the Sixth International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC) sponsored by Heartland Institute are available on the web. Go to: <http://climateconference.heartland.org/watch-live/>

Alternative energy, such as wind power, is so popular with many politicians and governments that it has become a mania similar to the canal construction frenzy that seized many politicians in the United States prior to the Civil War. Opened in 1825, New York State's Erie Canal was a great success, permitting the transportation of goods between the Atlantic seaboard and the Great Lakes region of the country, through the Appalachian Mountain range, avoiding much of the difficult terrain by taking advantage of a natural glacial channel, the only major cut in the mountains for hundreds of miles. At the time, water was by far the least expensive way to transport goods.

Many other state governments and communities tried to duplicate the success and most failed, burdening the bond holders, or worse, if financed by government guarantees, the citizens of the states and communities. Many failed quickly because the projects were poorly conceived and the economics were bad. Others failed later, when a generally superior form of inexpensive transport over irregular terrain was developed – the railroads.

Today, many politicians and government officials, often driven by the green industry, are seized in a mania of wind (or solar) power for the generation of electricity, even though it is a high cost, inefficient, unreliable method of generating electricity, depending upon the whims of nature. By contrast, coal generation is reliable, operates on demand, and, comparatively, is low cost. Very simply, wind promoters ignore the economics. It is as if they are promoting the building of canals over the Appalachian Mountains after the railroads have already crossed them at numerous locations.

Touted as providing jobs, wind projects are a long term financial burden on taxpayers and electricity consumers. They are not financially viable without government subsidies and mandates, and without these the industry would collapse as quickly as poorly conceived canal projects collapsed in the 1800s. Simply, so-called sustainable energy is not sustainable without governments forcing the financial burdens onto others. Wind and solar will remain unsustainable until an effective, inexpensive means of storing electricity becomes available on a commercial scale.

Storage of electricity has been a technologically vexing problem for decades, affecting all base-load electricity producers that often have excess generation capability during the parts of the day (usually nighttime) when the demand is low. Yet, political promoters of wind and solar conveniently overlook such shortcomings.

The political leaders of Great Britain are determined to make it a leader in wind power. Several reports this week illustrate the financial hardships and the absurd situations that government wind policy is causing. The Global Warming Policy Forum reported two articles explaining how government policy is expanding energy (fuel) poverty. Energy poverty is defined as households forced to pay more than 10% of their take home income for energy.

The UK charity (non-profit), Renewable Electricity Subsidies (RES) calculates that, under current policies, the probable cost of renewable Electricity Subsidies may reach the range of £100 Billion by 2030. This is excellent news for those thriving by subsidies (rent seekers) and terrible news for the general public.

RES also reports that grid operators are paying wind farms significant sums not to produce electricity because wind generated electricity is so unreliable and disruptive to the grid. Of course, electricity consumers pay these costs. Please see articles referenced under “Alternative Clean (Green) Energy” for what promoters ignore.

Electric Luxury Cars: Last week’s TWTW referenced an article by Eric Peters on the Tesla automobile company which was promoted by Al Gore’s investment group and to which the US Department of Energy gave loan guarantees and incentives of about \$500 Million. The first car in production is the Tesla Roadster with a base price of \$109,000. Peters revealed that the car is based on the tiny Lotus Elise which has a base price of about \$51,800 – not a bad mark-up for the electric drive.

Production for the affordable Tesla family version, Model S, is scheduled to start in 2012 with an estimated base price \$56,400 – hardly a car for the average family. Of course, it comes with a \$7,500 US tax credit.

Fisker, another new electric automobile company that received over \$500 Million in loan guarantees and incentives, was strongly promoted by Vice-President Biden. A Washington dealer just announced it will be receiving deliveries in August of the first model, the Karma, which has an announced base price of about \$95,900. It is a hybrid, similar to the Chevy Volt, blending some electric power with the convenience of a gasoline engine. Not as luxurious, the Volt has a base price of about \$41,000 before tax

credits up to \$7,500. A search of the internet failed to reveal an estimated price or deliver schedule for the lower-cost family version of the Fisker automobile.

In contrast to the successful Volkswagen by Germany, apparently the US Department of Energy believes the best way to build an electric car fleet is to promote high cost versions first, hoping to bring down cost with volume, as if cars are similar to consumer electronics. Please see articles referenced under “Alternative, Clean, (Green) Energy.

Number of the Week: 34,000 premature deaths. On Thursday, EPA announced its new regulations of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions from power plants and claimed these new regulations “will prevent 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks and 400,000 cases of asthma starting in 2014.” *The Hill* The EPA claims are not creditable.

For example, asthma is a perplexing disease. According to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), the prevalence of asthma has grown from 3.1% of the US population in 1980 to 8.2% in 2009, particularly in the Northeast and Midwest regions. Yet, objective measurements in various cities show that outdoor air quality has improved enormously in urban areas since the 1970s. The NCHS report states that: “Although little is understood about preventing asthma from developing, the means for controlling and preventing symptoms are well established.” Yet, EPA claims it can prevent 400,000 cases of asthma per year by further regulating SO₂ and NO_x. EPA should be compelled to demonstrate this causal relationship that, thus far, defies medical science. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr032.pdf>

The EPA also claims these compounds cause acid rain which pollutes forests, farms, lakes and streams across the Eastern United States. Environmental advocates claim the regulations will end “the chronic acidifications of lakes and ponds in the Adirondacks.” Yet, all rain is acidic, with a natural pH of about 5.6. The pH of some of some lakes in the Adirondack Mountains of New York has been measured as low as 4.5. There are several issues to this controversy, which require carefully controlled measurements to resolve. Is the pH of the rain falling in the Adirondacks below 5.6? If so, then the cause may be sulfur emissions from coal fired plants. But such measurements are not reported by the alarmists. Does the run off of the rain water have a lower pH than the rain? Then the cause may be the erosion of high acid soils. Also, what is the pH of still rain water with vegetation litter from the area? This can be established experimentally. If the pH is lower, than acidic vegetation may be a major cause of the low pH in the ponds.

Some representatives from the utility industry predict significant job loss resulting from the closure of coal fired plants; others said they are prepared for it. Without a careful analysis of all plants, it is impossible to accurately project the consequences of EPA’s actions. However, many large base-load plants are designed to operate year-round and generally are well equipped with the necessary, expensive scrubbers because the costs can be prorated over the year. The plants that supply seasonal increases in electricity generation, such as winter and summer, are often not so well equipped because the costs of the equipment cannot be so easily justified. The EPA actions may result in significant jumps in peak season electricity costs. Without substantiation, it is speculative to state that the closing of the seasonal plants will not have significant consequences. Please see referenced articles under “EPA on the March.”

Sulfur Dioxide and Soot Hiding Global Warming? Almost as an introduction to the new EPA sulfur dioxide regulations, a new study announced that the emissions of sulfur from Asia, particularly China, are hiding the global warming that is projected by the climate models, but is missing from observations. The study was cited widely in the press. A simple examination of the warming trends as described by over 30 years of satellite data calls this study into question.

Most of the warming has been in the northern part of the Northern Hemisphere. There has been little warming below about 35 deg. north. There has been both slight cooling and warming in the Southern Hemisphere. China is largely between 20 deg. N and 45 deg. N. How the SO2 emissions from China affect the warming, or lack thereof, in the Southern Hemisphere requires an explanation of wind patterns that is contrary to the generally accepted ones. Please see articles referenced under “Defenders of the Orthodoxy.”

Richard Lindzen is the subject of a rather complimentary article in the New York Times. Lindzen is, of course, one of the rocks challenging the orthodoxy. Is the Gray Lady recognizing that not all “deniers,” a term Lindzen rather likes, are rabid, anti-science zealots? Please see referenced article under “Challenging the Orthodoxy.”

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see: www.sepp.org.

1. NIPCC vs. IPCC

Addressing the Disparity between Climate Models and Observations:

Testing the Hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW)

By S. Fred Singer, to be presented at Majorana Conference, Erice, Sicily, August 2011

http://www.sepp.org/scientific%20papers/IPCC%20Booklet_2011_FINAL.pdf

2. Shot with its own gun

Editorial, Nature, Jun 30, 2011

http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v474/n7353/full/474541a.html?WT.ec_id=NATURE-20110630

[With Comments by Fred Singer on the SEPP web site.]

3. Rules of engagement

By Martin Livermore, Scientific Alliance, Jul 7, 2011

<http://www.scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/rules-engagement>

4. Jobs in the Pipeline

The EPA tries to scuttle oil transport from Canada's tar sands.

Editorial, WSJ, Jul 7, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304760604576426050150189280.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued

Michael Mann and the ClimageGate Whitewash, Part II

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Jul 5, 2011

<http://blogs.forbes.com/larrybell/2011/07/05/michael-mann-and-the-climategate-whitewash-part-ii/>

Dirty Laundry II: Contaminated Sediments

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Jul 6, 2011

<http://climateaudit.org/2011/07/06/dirty-laundry-ii-contaminated-sediments/#more-14008>

[SEPP Comment: Rather than retracting their study or admitting the data is contaminated, “the Team” pretends it makes no difference. The main issue is will IPCC AR5 use such a study with contaminated data.]

ICO orders release of (mostly useless) weather station data

CRU cuts of weather datasets released into the wild

By Andrew Orlowski, A Register, Jun 28, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/06/28/ico_climategate_release_this_rubbish/

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Lukewarmers, Denialists, and Other Climate Change Skeptics

Impressions and reporting from the Sixth International Climate Change Conference

By Ronald Bailey, Reason.com, July 5, 2011

<http://reason.com/archives/2011/07/05/lukewarmers-denialists-and-ot>

Scientists Tout Climate Skepticism at Heartland Conference Kickoff

By Jean Chemnick, NYT, Jun 30, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2011/06/30/30greenwire-scientists-tout-climate-skepticism-at-heartland-70831.html>

A Climate Change Dissenter Who Has Left His Mark on U.S. Policy

By John Fialka, NYT, Jul 6, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2011/07/06/06climatewire-a-climate-change-dissenter-who-has-left-his-76048.html>

[SEPP Comment: An article on Richard Lindzen]

The science is not settled

By Bob Carter, Sydney Morning Herald, Jul 3, 2011 [H/t Tom Harris]

<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/the-science-is-not-settled-20110702-1gvy6.html>

Global Warming Standstill Confirmed – But How Long Will It Last

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Jul 4, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://thegwpf.org/the-observatory/3373-global-warming-standstill-confirmed-but-how-long-will-it-last.html>

The UN's Climate of Desperation

By David Rothbard, Townhall, 7/2/2011

http://townhall.com/columnists/davidrothbard/2011/07/02/the_uns_climate_of_desperation/page/full/

Science Corruption at the National Academies of Science

By Michael Fox, Hawaii Reporter, Jul 5, 2011 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.hawaiireporter.com/science-corruption-at-the-national-academies-of-science/123>

Bet Your Country

By Donn Dears, Power USA, Jul 5, 2011

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2011/07/05/bet-your-country/>

Even U.N. Admits That Going Green Will Cost \$76 Trillion

By Dan Gainor, Fox News.com, Jul 6 2011 [H/t Brad at Prescott]

<http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/07/06/even-un-admits-that-going-green-will-cost-76-trillion/#ixzz1RN5ZVhww>

Defenders of the Orthodoxy

Developing world need \$1 trillion a year for green tech: UN

By Staff Writers, AFP, Jul 5, 2011

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Developing_world_need_1_trillion_a_year_for_green_tech_UN_999.html

[SEPP Comment: To be provided by taxpayers in developed countries and to be handled by the UN and its favored carbon traders.]

Asia pollution blamed for halt in warming: study

By Gerard Wynn, Reuters, Jul 4, 2011 [H/t Peter Salonijs]

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/04/us-climate-sulphur-idUSTRE7634IQ20110704>

[SEPP Comment: Desperation! Another effort to find the “missing” warming. The failure of the Southern Hemisphere to warm as projected is caused by emissions from China, latitude between 20 to 45 deg. N?]

CA climate: inland warmer; coast cooler and wetter

By Peter Fimrite, San Francisco Chronicle, Jul 6, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/07/06/MNDM1K6KFE.DTL>

[SEPP Comment: A conclusion of California climate trends taken from a sample of 8 urban areas. One, Reno, is in Nevada over the high Sierra Nevada Mountains.]

Report: Shipping emissions to rise in Arctic

By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, Jul 4, 2011 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/report-shipping-emissions-to-rise-in-arctic/2011/07/01/gHQAhkG6xH_story.html

Questioning the Orthodoxy

Coal Stops Global Warming?

Editorial, IBD, Jul 6, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=577495&p=1>

Questioning the European Green

Shelving of energy bill shows government is not serious about its green agenda

Delay means that the 'green deal' – the centrepiece of David Cameron's climate change policy – has been sidelined

By Meg Hillier, Guardian, UK, Jul 7, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jul/07/energy-bill-shelved>

Snoopy and the Green Baron

Airline opposition to carbon trading another blow against EU system

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Jul 5, 2011

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/07/05/peter-foster-snoopy-and-the-green-baron/>

“With Alice in Wonderland reasoning, countries that supported the tougher targets — including Britain and France — suggested that since Europe was in such economic bad shape, meeting the targets would be easier. On this basis, what is really needed is a complete collapse of the European economy, which is in fact what many climate catastrophists would appear to welcome.”

Problems within the Orthodoxy

You mustn't believe the lies of the Green zealots. And I should know - I was one

By Mark Lynas, Mail Online, Jul 4, 2011 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2010981/You-mustnt-believe-lies-Green-zealots-And-I-know--I-one.html>

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate?

Wars, food shortages and mass immigration: How global warming poses dire threat to Britain's security

By David Derbyshire, Daily Mail, UK, Jul 8, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2012349/Wars-food-shortages-mass-immigration-How-global-warming-poses-dire-threat-Britains-security.html>

Models v. Data

New Paper Illustrates Another Failure Of The IPCC Multi-Decadal Global Model Predictions – “On the Warming In The Tropical Upper Troposphere: Models Versus Observations” By Fu Et Al 2011

By Roger Pielke, Sr, Pielke Climate Science, Jul 8, 2011

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2011/07/08/new-paper-illustrates-another-failure-of-the-ippc-multi-decadal-global-model-predictions-on-the-warming-in-the-tropical-upper-troposphere-models-versus-observations-by-fu-et-al-2011/>

Measurement Issues

More On the Divergence Between the UAH and RSS Global Temperature Records

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Jul 8, 2011

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/>

Changing Weather

UAH Global Temperature Update for June, 2011: +0.31 deg. C

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, July 7th, 2011

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/category/blogarticle/>

[SEPP Comment: Please read the column to understand the significance.]

Think It's Getting Hotter? Thank Again

Editorial, IBD, Jul 6, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/577503/201107061854/Think-Its-Getting-Hotter-Think-Again.htm>

Public records show Corps reacted too late to avoid flood

By Matt Bunk, Great Plains Examiner, Jul 2, 2011 [H/t Charles Rigler]

<http://www.greatplainsexaminer.com/2011/07/02/public-records-show-corps-reacted-too-late-to-avoid-flood/>

[SEPP Comment: It was bound to happen.]

Aircraft Influence the Local Weather, New Study Shows; Inadvertent Cloud Seeding Can Increase Precipitation Around Major Airports

By Staff Writers, Science Daily, Jun 30, 2011 [H/t Cliff Bamford]

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/06/110630142835.htm>

[SEPP Comment; Does this affect the reliability of weather measurements taken at airports?]

Dust Storm Swarms Phoenix

By Christine McEnrue, WeatherBELL, July 6, 2011

<http://www.weatherbell.com/weather-news/dust-storm-swarms-phoenix/>

[SEPP Comment: There is an old local term for such storms – haboob.]

Changing Climate

Is Warmer Really the New Normal?

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, Jul 7, 2011

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Warmeristhenewnormal.pdf>

Arctic Temperatures and Ice – Why it is Natural Variability

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, Jul 3, 2011

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/ARCTIC.pdf>

Sunspot decline could mean decades of cold UK winters

Ice-skating on the Thames to make a comeback?

By Lewis Page, A Register, Jul 6, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/07/06/lockwood_solar_minimum/

Researchers considering climate change

By Staff Writers, UPI, Jul 1, 2011

http://www.terraily.com/reports/Researchers_considering_climate_change_999.html

[SEPP Comment: I have not seen weather like this; therefore, it must be climate change!]

La Nina's Exit Leaves Climate Forecasts in Limbo

By Staff Writers, JPL, Jun 30, 2011

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/La_Nina_Exit_Leaves_Climate_Forecasts_in_Limbo_999.html

[SEPP Comment: The IPCC AR-4 does not recognize any of these events as influencing climate.]

The Political Games Continue

White House blasts Energy and Water spending bill

By Andrew Restuccia The Hill, Jul 6, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/169973-white-house-blasts-energy-and-water-spending-bill>

Cap-and-Trade and Carbon Taxes

Wait and see

What the Prime Minister should be telling us

By John McLean, Quadrant, Jul 6, 2011

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/07/wait-see>

Emergency Loans for Australian Coal Plants Hit by Carbon Tax

By Staff Writers, POWER News, Jul 6, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3837.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2235287&hq_l=12&hq_v=5e660500d0

[SEPP Comment: Government playing favorites.]

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Kenya project: making safer water to sell carbon credits

By Staff Writers, AFP, Jun 30, 2011

http://www.terraily.com/reports/Kenya_project_making_safer_water_to_sell_carbon_credits_999.html

[SEPP Comment: A practical use for carbon credits, but a straight donation would be less costly – it eliminates the middleman – the carbon trader.]

EPA and other Regulators on the March

EPA finalizes rules for cross-state air pollution

By Andrew Restuccia The Hill, Jul 7, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/170165-epa-finalizes-rules-for-cross-state-air-pollution>

E.P.A. Issues Tougher Rules for Power Plants

By John Broder, NYT, Jul 7, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/08/science/earth/08epa.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=th23

[SEPP Comment: Longer version of the above.]

EPA Funds Green Groups That Sue the Agency to Expand

By John Merline, IBD, Jul 6, 2011

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=577430&p=1>

[SEPP Comment: A deceitful practice that should be stopped.]

Last chance for GOP to stop EPA train wreck

Obama's greenhouse-gas regulations about to kill more jobs

By Steve Milloy, Washington Times, Jul 5, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/5/last-chance-for-gop-to-stop-epa-train-wreck/>

An overblown attack on EPA emissions rules

Editorial, Washington Post, Jul 2, 2011 [H/t David Manuta]

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/an-overblown-attack-on-epa-emissions-rules/2011/06/24/AGtjmZvH_story.html?wpisrc=emailtoafriend

[SEPP Comment: Use of selected numbers to defend the EPA. See comments in This Week.]

Energy Issues

Obama's energy policies deserve to be junked

By Sol Sanders, Washington Times, Jul 3, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/3/sanders-obamas-energy-policies-deserve-to-be-junked/>

Obama's plan for \$10 Gas

By Jeffrey Folks, American Thinker, Jul 8, 2011

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/07/obamas_plan_for_10_gas.html

House votes to scuttle ban on high-carbon defense fuels

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Jul 8, 2011

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/170353-house-votes-to-scuttle-ban-on-high-carbon-defense-fuels>

[SEPP Comment: Stopping a DOD boondoggle.]

Yellowstone River rising, Exxon Cleanup Becoming More Difficult

By Christine McEnrue, WeatherBELL, July 5 11

<http://www.weatherbell.com/weather-news/yellowstone-river-rising-exxon-cleanup-becoming-more-difficult/>

[SEPP Comment: A spill of 1000 barrels that alarmists will use to try to stop approvals of the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada to Texas.]

ExxonMobil expands Yellowstone pipeline cleanup

By Staff Writers, AFP, Jul 3, 2011

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/ExxonMobil_expands_Yellowstone_pipeline_cleanup_999.html

Nuclear Fears & Responses

Japan Restricts Power Usage, India Also Experiencing Shortages

By Staff Writers, POWER News, Jul 6, 2011

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3842.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2235287&hq_l=10&hq_v=5e660500d0

Power company RWE wants compensation for nuclear opt-out

By Staff Writers, AFP, Jul 3, 2011

http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/Power_company_RWE_wants_compensation_for_nuclear_opt-out_999.html

Nuclear's loss is German wind power's gain

Chancellor Merkel's nuclear phase-out is good news for the wind industry but meeting Germany's new offshore targets will require the right political framework and careful planning.

By Jason Deign, Wind Energy Update, Jul 4, 2011

http://social.windenergyupdate.com/offshore-wind/nuclear%E2%80%99s-loss-german-wind-power%E2%80%99s-gain?utm_source=http%3a%2f%2fcommunicator.windenergyupdate.com%2f%2f&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=WEU+E-Breif+0507&utm_term=Nuclear%E2%80%99s+loss+is+German+wind+power%E2%80%99s+gain&utm_content=533066

Dirtier Air and Higher Costs Possible if Indian Point Closes, Report Says

By Patrick McGeehan, NYT, Jul 6, 2011

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/07/nyregion/dirtier-air-and-higher-costs-may-follow-indian-point-closing.html?_r=2&hp

[SEPP Comment: New York City receives about 25% of its electricity from nuclear. The mayor of New York City, who is a wind power advocate, can put wind turbines on every building in the City and it will not come close to the electricity needed to run the City. The next step is to cover most of Long Island or Connecticut.]

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Black gold rush in Texas

By Ton D'Altorio, Stockhouse, Jul 6, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.stockhouse.com/Columnists/2011/Jul/6/Black-gold-rush-in-Texas>

Administration Control of Fossil Fuels

Canada Has Plenty of Oil, but Does the U.S. Want It?

By Chip Cummins and Edward Welsch, WSJ, Jul 8, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303763404576418120173841168.html?mod=WSJ_hp_LEFTTopStories

[SEPP comment: A failure to approve the Keystone XL pipeline to bring oil from Canada to refineries in Texas will illustrate the falsehood of those who argue that national security requires oil from reliable sources. May be behind a pay wall.]

Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy

A Quarter Of Brits Are Living In Fuel Poverty As Energy Bills Rocket

From Global Warming Policy Forum, Jul 6, 2011 [H/t Gordon Fulks]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/3393-britains-shame-a-quarter-of-brits-are-living-in-fuel-poverty-as-energy-bills-rocket.html>

[SEPP Comment: Two separate articles on the same topic.]

The Probable Cost of UK Renewable Electricity Subsidies 2002-2030

By John Constable & Lee Moroney, Renewable Energy Foundation, Jun 20, 2011

<http://www.ref.org.uk/publications/238-the-probable-cost-of-uk-renewable-electricity-subsidies-2002-2030>

[SEPP Comment: Just another £100 Billion.]

Consumers Pay Scottish Wind Farms to Throw Energy Away

Press Release, Renewable Energy Foundation, May 17, 2011

<http://www.ref.org.uk/press-releases/233-consumers-pay-scottish-wind-farms-to-throw-energy-away>

Scottish Wind Power Constraint Payments Update

John Constable & Lee Moroney, Renewable Energy Foundation, Jun 30, 2011

<http://www.ref.org.uk/publications/239-scottish-wind-power-constraint-payments-update>

Wind power numbers down in Britain

By Staff Writers, UPI, Jul 1, 2011

http://www.winddaily.com/reports/Wind_power_numbers_down_in_Britain_999.html

“The amount of electricity generated by U.K. wind farms fell last year because of the lowest average wind speeds this century, government statistics show.”

Solar Panel Myth Exposed

By Lauren Thompson, Daily Mail, Jul 6, 2011 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.mailonsunday.co.uk/money/article-2011540/Energy-experts-slash-estimates-household-savings-using-solar-panels.html>

Plug pulled on electric car subsidy from the Government in two years

By Tom Mcghie, Mail, UK, Jul 3, 2011

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/money/article-2010561/Plug-pulled-electric-car-subsidy-Government-years.html>

The Obama Car

By Eric Peters American Spectator, Jul 7, 2011

<http://spectator.org/archives/2011/07/07/the-obama-car>

[SEPP Comment: The concept of inertia eludes the administration’s imagination.]

Ruling on ‘rare earth’ goes against China

By Claire Courchane, Washington Times, Jul 5, 2011

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/5/ruling-on-rare-earth-goes-against-china/>

[SEPP Comment: Enforcement will be interesting.]

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

A Reassessment of Long-Term Atlantic Hurricane Statistics

Reference: Vecchi, G.A. and Knutson, T.R. 2011. Estimating annual numbers of Atlantic hurricanes missing from the HURDAT database (1878-1965) using ship track density. *Journal of Climate* 24: 1736-1746.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jul/5jul2011a1.html>

Given such findings, the two researchers from NOAA's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory state their results "do not support the hypothesis that the warming of the tropical North Atlantic due to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions has caused Atlantic hurricane frequency to increase."

The Glacial Climate of Ammassalik Island, Greenland

Reference: Mernild, S.H., Kane, D.L., Hansen, B.U., Jakobsen, B.H., Hasholt, B. and Knudsen, N.T. 2008. Climate, glacier mass balance and runoff (1993-2005) for the Mittivakkat Glacier catchment, Ammassalik Island, SE Greenland, and in a long term perspective (1898-1993). *Hydrology Research* 39: 239-256.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jul/6jul2011a3.html>

During the past century of general mass loss, they found that "periods of warming were observed from 1918 (the end of the Little Ice Age) to 1935 of 0.12°C per year and 1978 to 2004 of 0.07°C per year," and they say that "the warmest average 10-year period within the last 106 years was the period from 1936-1946 (-1.8°C)," while the second warmest period was from 1995-2004 (-2.0°C). In addition, they note that "also on West Greenland the period 1936-1946 was the warmest period within the last 106 years (Cappelen, 2004)."

Overcoming Photoinhibition in a Tropical Tree Species

Reference: Rasineni, G.K., Guha, A. and Reddy, A.R. 2011. Elevated atmospheric CO2 mitigated photoinhibition in a tropical tree species, *Gmelina arborea*. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology* 103: 159-165.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jul/6jul2011a4.html>

[SEPP Comment: Significant increases in photosynthesis during mid-day from CO2 enrichment.]

A History of Drought Duration and Frequency in the U.S. Corn Belt

Reference: Stambaugh, M.C., Guyette, R.P., McMurphy, E.R., Cook, E.R., Meko, D.M. and Lupo, A.R. 2011. Drought duration and frequency in the U.S. Corn Belt during the last millennium (AD 992-2004). *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 151: 154-162.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/jul/6jul2011a5.html>

It is abundantly clear from Stambaugh et al.'s findings that there is nothing unusual, unnatural or unprecedented about any 20th or 21st century droughts that may have occurred throughout the agricultural heartland of the United States. It is also clear that the much greater droughts of the past millennium occurred during periods of both relative cold and relative warmth, as well as the transitions between them. Thus, to testify that "droughts are becoming longer and more intense," and to imply that they are doing so because of global warming, is to be doubly disingenuous.

Other Scientific News

Getting Ready for the Next Big Solar Storm

By Dr Tony Phillips for NASA Science News, SPX, Jun 27, 2011

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Getting_Ready_for_the_Next_Big_Solar_Storm_999.html

Other News that May Be of Interest

FUNDANOMICS: The Free Market, Simplified

By Roy W. Spencer, His Blog, Jul 4, 2011 [H/T WUWT]

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2011/07/fundanomics-the-free-market-simplified/>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Weed-Covered, Neglected Solar Park: 20 Acres, \$11 Million, Only One And Half Years Old!

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Jul 4, 2011 [H/t WUWT]

<http://notrickszone.com/2011/07/04/weed-covered-solar-park-20-acres-11-million-only-one-and-half-years-old/>

#####

ARTICLES:

1. NIPCC vs. IPCC

Addressing the Disparity between Climate Models and Observations:

Testing the Hypothesis of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW)

By S. Fred Singer, to be presented at Majorana Conference, Erice, Sicily, August 2011

http://www.sepp.org/scientific%20papers/IPCC%20Booklet_2011_FINAL.pdf

Please download from the web site

2. Shot with its own gun

Editorial, Nature, Jun 30, 2011

http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v474/n7353/full/474541a.html?WT.ec_id=NATURE-20110630

[With Comments by Fred Singer]

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change must implement changes now to regain lost credibility or it will remain an easy target for critics seeking to score cheap points.

For more than 20 years, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has performed the essential and time-consuming task of pooling and making publicly accessible the evolving knowledge base gleaned from climate-change research. Its efforts were rewarded in 2007 with the Nobel Peace Prize — not bad for what is basically a voluntary organization staffed by thousands of working scientists. But in the past two years, the IPCC has displayed a talent for manoeuvring itself into embarrassing situations, making itself an easy target for critics and climate sceptics.

The problems began in late 2009, when it was reported that the IPCC's fourth assessment report, published two years earlier, mistakenly claimed that all Himalayan glaciers could melt by 2035. The subsequent fallout seriously damaged the IPCC's credibility, and was exacerbated by the inept attempts of the group's chairman, Rajendra Pachauri, to contain the crisis. A subsequent review of the organization's governance and policies saw it commit to a number of wide-ranging reforms.

This month, the IPCC is in the crosshairs again. The revelation that a Greenpeace energy analyst helped to write a key chapter in the IPCC's *Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation*, released last month, sparked widespread criticism across the blogosphere. Compared with the glacier faux pas, the latest incident is trivial. But it should remind the IPCC that its recently reworked policies and procedures need to be implemented, visibly and quickly.

In response to the glacier blunder, the IPCC pledged greater caution in the processes it uses to select scientific experts and to evaluate grey literature, and to make sure that (unpaid) work for the panel does not clash with interests arising from the professional affiliations of its staff and contributing authors (see [Nature 473, 261; 2011](#)). But it has failed to make clear when this new conflict-of-interest policy will come into effect and whom it will cover. It needs to do so — and fast.

This is the only way that the organization can counter recurring claims that it is less policy-neutral than its mandate from the United Nations obliges it to be. In particular, it needs to make clear the position for the working groups on climate-change impacts and adaptation (the science group adopted a rigid conflict-of-interest policy last year). Pachauri is on record as saying that the new conflict-of-interest policy will not apply retrospectively to the hundreds of authors already selected for the IPCC's fifth assessment report, due in 2014. This is unacceptable. He should make it a priority to ensure that the rules cover everyone involved — including himself.

“The IPCC should reconsider how it frames its findings.”

Claims in the blogosphere that Greenpeace 'dictated' the IPCC's renewable-energy report are vastly exaggerated. In fact, the Greenpeace writer was one of six authors of a peer-reviewed paper that examined an extreme scenario of favourable economic conditions that allowed the maximum possible take-up of renewable energy sources by 2050. Although the scenario is optimistic — and no doubt in line with the agenda at Greenpeace HQ — its inclusion is entirely justified. How else could the report answer the question of how much renewable energy would be possible under different economic assumptions?

Greenpeace probably fights just as hard to promote its values as the fossil-fuel lobby does for its own interests. But in principle there is nothing wrong with asking experts from either side to contribute to the IPCC's reports — even though the reports represent a supposedly value-free extension of academic science. But by neglecting to ask the Greenpeace-linked author of the extreme scenario in question to disclose his affiliation and possible conflicts of interest openly and formally, the IPCC recklessly exposed itself to its critics.

The IPCC's vulnerability to such attacks should also prompt it to reconsider how it frames its findings. Journalists and critics alike gravitate towards extreme claims. So when the IPCC's press material for the May report prominently pushed the idea that renewables could provide “close to 80%” of the world's energy needs by 2050, it was no surprise that it was this figure that made headlines — and made waves. The IPCC would have saved itself a lot of trouble and some unwarranted criticism had it made the origins of this scenario explicit.

There is no escaping the fact that the IPCC operates in a latently hostile environment. Its critics are vocal, frequently melodramatic and unlikely to surrender the limelight any time soon. The IPCC has to stop handing them ammunition on a plate.

Comments by Fred Singer - July 4, 2011

Nature's critique (June 30, 2011) of the IPCC is long overdue but rather misses the main point. The errors which the editorial focuses on are “small change” in comparison to the IPCC claim of near-certainty that greenhouse gases are the major cause of global warming. The date of melting of Himalayan glaciers is obviously wrong, as is the Greenpeace-inspired claim that 80 percent of all energy can come from wind and solar. Neither of these embarrassing mistakes is fundamental and merely demonstrates sloppiness of IPCC procedures; they should have little impact on public policy.

On the other hand, as *Nature* revealed back in 1996 [vol 381, p.539], the deliberate changes in the basic science conclusions of the second IPCC Assessment Report were politically motivated. They led directly to the adoption of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which has already cost citizens of the developed nations many hundreds of billions and seems likely to continue to ruin their economies. Witness the current disastrous energy policies of Germany and Great Britain, which stem from the mistaken notion that increasing levels of carbon dioxide will lead to climate calamities.

3. Rules of engagement

By Martin Livermore, Scientific Alliance, Jul 7, 2011

<http://www.scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/rules-engagement>

Mark Lynas, author of ‘Six Degrees: Our future on a hotter planet’, has now published an interesting new book ‘The God Species: How the Planet can survive the Age of Humans’. At first glance, this is the sort of book you would expect to get a warm welcome from environmentalists and be roundly condemned by their intellectual opponents. But this is not really so; Lynas has written something which will infuriate

many environmentalists while getting a cautious welcome from some who are naturally sceptical of tales of doom and destruction.

The interesting thing is that he is showing independence of mind. Famously, Bjorn Lomborg set out to assemble the quantitative evidence to back up the main claims of the environmentalist movement and ended up writing 'The Skeptical Environmentalist', a heresy for which he has never been forgiven. Although Mark Lynas would probably not be comfortable with the parallel (he infamously once hit him with a custard pie in protest at his critical views on environmental issues) he is in fact following Lomborg's footsteps. Some greens may now think he deserves similar treatment.

His first act of apostasy was to look at the evidence on genetically modified crops and conclude that there was little to be concerned about. He has this week written an op-ed for the Times (To abolish starvation Africa needs GM crops) in which he says '*As a former anti-GM campaigner, I used to join "decontamination" actions in the middle of the night, trampling and slashing down crop trials in the UK in the late 1990s. Looking back, I realise I was caught up in something more resembling anti-scientific mass hysteria rather than any rational response to a new technology.*' Congratulations for not continuing with blind prejudice.

Similarly, Mark Lynas has publicly supported nuclear power as an essential way to generate low-carbon energy. This he does because he continues to subscribe to the mainstream view that it is carbon dioxide emissions which are driving potentially dangerous global warming. Another high-profile environmentalist who has come to the same conclusion is James Lovelock.

Lynas very publicly broke ranks when he appeared in the Channel 4 documentary What the Green Movement Got Wrong in late 2010, alongside Patrick Moore (co-founder of Greenpeace and now one of their most prominent critics) and Stewart Brand (founder and president of the Whole Earth Catalogue). Their essential message was that the green movement had become too fond of turning issues into a choice between black and white and was unprepared to look at things in a more balanced and rational way. In their collective view, technologies such as nuclear power generation and genetic engineering could be part of the solution to major problems rather than the dangerous tools of evil capitalists.

I watched the programme when it was originally shown and thought it was a well-made attempt to put over a point of view which is not often heard, that 'green' and 'natural' are not always completely right and 'science' and 'business' not always irretrievably bad. Perhaps not surprisingly, the programme was controversial and attracted some strong views from both sides of the argument, although with a bias towards the critical. For example, here are some verbatim quotes from comments left on the website:

'What a load of anti environmental propaganda...I think certain multinational GM and nuclear corporations may have had an interest in the production of this material. I find this documentary highly disturbing after devoting 7 years of my life in college to Environmental Science I must advise anyone watching this documentary that the information within is highly biasand one sided.'

'The only way foward for world agriculture is to embrace eco-technology, in particular the work of Viktor Schauberger. By understanding the true workings of nature, we can create an abundance of the highest quality food, all the time allowing the land in which it is grown to thrive and reach is maximum level of fertility, which is only possible through allowing the natural processes to happen...'

'...Have we all forgot what damage GM can do to the environment associated with growing these crops? The balance of nature will be thrown and perhaps cause irreversible damage....'

'...Putting the worlds food crops into the hands of a tiny number of corporations who are reducing the gene bank to an absolute minimum is a sure recipe for world starvation.'

Some strong views from a number of people whose minds are clearly made up. Campaigning environmentalist organisations continue to be in tune emotionally with many people, particularly (but by no means exclusively) the young and idealistic. Modern culture reinforces this: it is unusual to find popular musicians or actors who do not espouse the green cause in some way. The Greenpeace banners at Glastonbury are part of the furniture, whereas corporate sponsorship would doubtlessly cause outrage.

Coming back to Mark Lynas, he sums up the problem for many greens very well: *'Being an environmentalist was part of my identity and most of my friends were environmentalists. We were involved in the whole movement together. It took me years to actually begin to question those core, cherished beliefs. It was so challenging it was almost like going over to the dark side. It was a like a horrible dark secret you couldn't share with anyone.'*

That really encapsulates the problem: if you identify with a particular movement, you are expected to share its main beliefs and questioning these is simply not welcome. Opponents are not deemed worthy of proper debate, and environmentalists who dissent on particular issues, such as Lomborg and Lynas, are regarded as traitors and treated as such (or occasionally, as suffering from some kind of delusion). Not that this is confined to the greens; identification with a particular cause or belief often means indulging in groupthink to fit in.

One of the outcomes is that it can be very difficult to engage properly with people whose views you oppose. We know that rational argument rarely changes people's minds if they have an established strong view, but it is always good to encourage debate in which the two sides at least listen to the arguments. Too often, the views of others are not just rubbished, but their personal credibility is attacked. Perhaps the confrontational style of modern media is partly to blame, but there does seem to be an aspect of human nature which many people struggle to control (if they try at all).

It is natural that people form opinions and argue with those who disagree with them. But the fact that people can change their minds on contentious issues shows that all is not necessarily black and white. Life would be a whole lot more civilised if we agreed at least to treat the views of others as worthy of thought rather than beneath contempt. So perhaps we should all consider adopting two primary rules of engagement:

1. Never make *ad hominem* attacks. This is the surest way to lose your own credibility in the eyes of any objective observer.
2. Always try to see the positive side of an opposing argument before answering. Showing respect, even if you fundamentally disagree, can never do any harm.

4. Jobs in the Pipeline

The EPA tries to scuttle oil transport from Canada's tar sands.

Editorial, WSJ, Jul 7, 2011

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304760604576426050150189280.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop

With 9.1% unemployment and gasoline prices in the stratosphere, President Obama must sometimes wish that some big corporation would suddenly show up and offer a shovel-ready, multibillion-dollar project to create 100,000 jobs and reduce U.S. reliance on oil from dictatorships.

Oh, wait. His Secretary of State has had that offer sitting on her desk since she was sworn in. The trouble is that the Administration can't approve it without upsetting its anti-fossil fuel constituency. And so the proposal sits.

In September 2008 TransCanada applied to build a new pipeline—the Keystone XL—to bring diluted bitumen from the oil-rich tar sands of Alberta to thirsty American refineries on the Gulf Coast. It is hardly a radical proposal. Canadian crude has been flowing to the U.S. for decades. Another Canadian company—Enbridge—operates the Clipper pipeline across the Canadian border to Chicago. In July 2010 TransCanada began operating its Keystone pipeline from Alberta to Cushing, Oklahoma, which is a major storage and pricing depot.

The Keystone XL would cut a slightly different path, through the American heartland to Port Arthur, Texas. Judging from its past experience and that of Enbridge, TransCanada expected that permitting would take roughly 23 months. Thirty-three months, two State Department studies and 208,000 public comments later, TransCanada is still waiting. On current trend, the company will be lucky to get its permit by January, or after 40 months. But even that is far from certain.

If Mr. Obama were drawing up a plan from scratch to boost union employment and deflate Iranian-ally Hugo Chávez of Venezuela, it might look like the Keystone XL. TransCanada estimates that building the pipeline will mean more than \$20 billion—\$13 billion from TransCanada itself—in investment and 13,000 new American jobs in construction and related manufacturing. The company also expects more than 118,000 "spin-off" jobs during the two years of construction.

TransCanada says it has signed building contracts with four major U.S. unions. It projects that construction will generate \$600 million in new state and local tax revenue and that over its life the pipeline will generate another \$5.2 billion in property taxes. The Energy Policy Research Foundation in Washington estimates that by linking to the XL, oil producers in North Dakota's Bakken region will enjoy efficiency gains of between \$36.5 million and \$146 million annually. Lower transport costs will mean savings for Gulf Coast refiners of \$473 million annually if the pipeline meets conservative expectations of shipping 400,000 barrels per day.

Today those refineries are highly dependent on imports from Mexico and Venezuela, which have decreased output in recent years. TransCanada would help to provide Gulf Coast refiners with a more reliable source of supply from a U.S. ally.

None of this is lost on the State Department, which must approve the project because it crosses the U.S. border. Its first environmental impact statement, in April 2010, found that the XL would meet industry standards and not significantly affect the environment. Without the pipeline, State said, the U.S. would not be able to benefit from cost-efficient Western Canadian oil and "would remain dependent upon unstable foreign oil supplies."

Hillary Clinton indicated early on that she was inclined to allow it and so it seemed the company would get its permit after a 90-day comment period. But the Environmental Protection Agency raised a stink and State acquiesced to a "supplemental" statement, which took months to prepare. On June 6, at the end of another 90-day comment period, the EPA stamped the report "inadequate" and sent State a nine-page letter with objections, which, no surprise, would require years of further study.

You could be forgiven for thinking that this must have something to do with pipeline safety. But pipelines remain the statistically safest way to transport oil, pipeline accident rates have fallen sharply, and technology has improved reaction time to leaks and the ability to contain them.

Friday's Exxon pipeline leak of up to 1,000 barrels along the Yellowstone River in Montana is a case in point. Any spill is unfortunate, but Exxon says it has put 150 workers on clean-up duty, has asked local residents to identify further damage, and has flown in 90,000 feet of absorbent boom, 3,000 absorbent pads and 2,200 feet of containment boom. TransCanada points out that for river crossings the XL will be 25-feet underground versus Exxon's eight feet (laid 20 years ago) and will feature other state-of-the-art safety enhancements.

So why the EPA push back? Ask the Natural Resources Defense Council. "This is really a campaign against tar sands expansion rather than a single pipeline," Susan Casey-Lefkowitz, director of the council's international program, told the New York Times last month. The EPA's June 6 letter echoes that point. It complains at length about the "[green house gas]-intensive" tar sands and frets about what Canadians are doing to migratory birds.

U.S. greens loathe oil, and the tar sands has become the next Alaska in green mythology. We get that. But what about jobs and growth? The U.S. economy needs a stable and affordable energy supply and, according to Cambridge Energy Research Associates (CERA), Canada's tar sands oil from "wells to wheels" isn't any "dirtier" than Nigerian light or California or Middle East heavy crude.

The Keystone XL pipeline is another case in which the Obama Administration's ideology clashes with its professed goal of job creation. Why do jobs always lose?

#####