

The Week That Was: 2013-09-28 (September 28, 2013)
Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)
The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

Quote of the Week: *If an honest man is wrong, after demonstrating that he is wrong, he either stops being wrong or he stops being honest.* Anonymous [H/t Tim Ball]

#####

Number of the Week: 0.065°C

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

NIPCC: The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) was established analyze peer reviewed research on climate change and report the findings as objectively as possible. The latest reports, **Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science** and the **Summary for Policymakers** are available on the web and the full Physical Science report being printed. They are formatted to match as closely as possible the formatting of the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to allow policymakers to make side-by-side comparisons of the reports.

One of the great shortcomings of the IPCC is that it was not set-up to evaluate all the influences on climate, both natural and human. Instead, it was set-up to evaluate only the human influences. This shortcoming should be emphasized in the IPCC reports. However, it is often glossed over.

Often, when exploring business opportunities or new products, private corporations will form two research teams to pursue alternative approaches, say the green team and the red team. The corporations will staff both teams with highly qualified people and give both equal levels of funding. One can think of the IPCC as the green team and the NIPCC as the red team. However, funding levels are vastly different. According to published reports by the US government, the total Federal funding of climate change activities is greater than \$150 Billion since Fiscal Year 1993. The small funding of NIPCC is from private contributors who have no influence on the product. The NIPCC reports can be found at: <http://climatechangereconsidered.org/>

IPCC: On Friday, the IPCC released its Summary for Policymakers. The report was not yet complete, it referenced graphs that were not presented and will have to be inserted. Therefore, a side-by-side comparison of the NIPCC and the IPCC reports is premature. However, there are some disturbing omissions. As Roy Spencer points out, estimates of the sensitivity of the climate to increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) are missing. Yet, this is the entire political issue. Is the climate sensitive to human emissions of CO₂ or not? Does an increase in the molecules of CO₂ from 3 to 4 per 10,000 parts of air make a difference in climate?

Further, the report glosses over the fact that there has been no statistically significant rise in surface temperatures for over 16 years. Instead, it asserts a greater certainty in its work than prior reports. It reduced the uncertainty from 10% to 5%, with no empirical basis.

Richard Lindzen writes “The latest IPCC report has truly sunk to level of hilarious incoherence — It is quite amazing to see the contortions the IPCC has to go through in order to keep the international climate agenda going.”

Prior to issuance of the approved report, Steve McIntyre presented an overview on how the IPCC put itself in a mess, rather than properly addressing the hiatus in warming and the associated discrepancy between model projections and observations. He writes: “One cannot help but wonder whether WG1 [the physical science section] Chair Thomas Stocker might not have served the policy community better by spending more time ensuring that the discrepancy between models and observations was properly addressed in the IPCC draft reports, perhaps even highlighting research problems while there was time in the process, than figuring out how IPCC could evade FOI [Freedom of Information] requests.

The purpose of a physical science is to describe nature, and to understand how it works. It is becoming increasingly evident that IPCC science does not describe nature. Yet, the IPCC intensifies its certainty in its work? For these and other comments see Climategate Continued, IPCC Report, and http://www.climatechange2013.org/images/uploads/WGIAR5-SPM_Approved27Sep2013.pdf

Support EPA? Although a side-by-side comparison of the two summaries will be presented later, one can examine how the two reports support the EPA’s finding that human greenhouse gas emissions, principally CO₂, endanger public health and welfare. When announcing its finding on December 7, 2009, the EPA stated that the finding was based on three lines of scientific evidence, which followed the 2007 IPCC report and US government reports:

1. There is a distinct human fingerprint, “hot spot,” of a pronounced warming trend centered about 10 km (33,000 feet) above the tropics. EPA claims this to be the physical evidence that supports the theory that CO₂ emissions are causing significant global warming.
2. Indirect evidence – the late 20th century warming was unusual – unprecedented and dangerous.
3. Climate models are reliable for policy analysis. All these models forecast significant future warming.

Based on the EPA’s finding, government agencies have undertaken calculating the future social costs of carbon dioxide emissions, are attempting to control land use by claiming future floods and dramatic sea level rise, and the EPA announced drastic measures for controlling construction of new power plants, which will effectively prohibit the construction of coal-fired power plants without very expensive, untested technology. Thus, it is important to investigate how solid is the EPA science in light of new, comprehensive, scientific reports on climate change.

1. Hot Spot:

IPCC: The IPCC summary does not discuss the “hot spot”, though it discusses atmospheric temperatures. This is a sharp departure from the 2007 report that discussed the hot spot.

NIPCC: The NIPCC summary specifically rejects the “hot spot” because no one can find it. “Observations from both weather balloon radiosonde and satellite MSU sensors show the opposite, with either flat or decreasing warming trends with increasing height in the atmosphere.” (p.7)

2. 20th Century Warming Was Unusual:

IPCC: The last 30 years is “likely to be the warmest 30-year period in Northern Hemisphere in 1400 years (medium confidence) (SPM-3). However, it also states: “Continental-scale surface temperature reconstructions show, with high confidence, multidecadal periods during the Medieval Climate Anomaly (year 950 to 1250) that were in some regions as warm as in the late 20th century. These regional warm periods did not occur as coherently across regions as the warming in the late 20th century (high confidence). {5.5} (SPM-4)” [The late 20th century global warming was not that unusual and largely confined to the Northern Hemisphere.]

NIPCC: “The glaciological and recent geological records contain numerous examples of ancient temperatures up to 3°C [about 6°F], or more, warmer than the peak reported at the end of the twentieth century.” (p.8)

3. Climate Models Are Reliable:

IPCC: “The long-term climate model simulations show a trend in global-mean surface temperature from 1951 to 2012 that agrees with the observed trend (very high confidence). There are, however, differences between simulated and observed trends over periods as short as 10 to 15 years (e.g., 1998 to 2012). {9.4, Box 9.2}” (SPM-10)

NIPCC: “Climate models project an atmospheric warming of at least 0.3 °C over the past 15 years; in fact, temperature stasis or slight cooling has occurred.” (p.9)

“We conclude that current generation of GCMs [Global Climate Models] are unable to make accurate projections of climate even 10 years ahead, let alone the 100 year period that has been adopted by policy planners. The output of such models should therefore not be used to guide public policy formulation until they have been validated and shown to have predictive value.” (p.7) [boldface in original]

Conclusion:

The IPCC Summary fails to support the critical physical evidence the EPA claimed. It weakly supports the other two lines of evidence, ignoring the fact that surface temperatures have not increased in 16 years. The NIPCC Summary rejects all three lines of evidence the EPA offered.

It is sufficient to say that the EPA endangerment finding was premature, at best. At worst, it is completely wrong. The links to the two reports are provide above.

MET Model: Independent scientist Nicolas Lewis and Andrew Montford are questioning a possible strong bias in the global climate model use by the UK MET Office. As described by the IPCC, in the climate models the warming influence of CO₂ is off-set, in part, by aerosols, minute particles in the atmosphere, such as sulfur dioxide. Among other things, aerosols promote the formation of clouds. Climate alarmists claim that the failure of the atmosphere to warm with increasing CO₂ is due to increases in aerosols. Thus, high climate sensitivity to CO₂ is offset by high climate sensitivity to aerosols.

Nicolas Lewis examined the procedures used in running the MET models and concluded that the process does not permit the possibility of a low climate sensitivity to both CO₂ and aerosols. The MET office has been alerted about the issue and is under review. If correct, then MET model and procedure have a significant built-in warming bias, which may apply to other climate models as well. Certainly, when comparing runs to observations for the tropics, the climate models greatly overestimate the warming. Please see links under Model Issues

EPA: In *Forbes*, Larry Bell discusses the recent testimony of EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy before the US House Energy Committee. Repeatedly, she was asked about the 26 objective indicators EPA has on its web site for tracking climate change and how the new regulations on new coal-fired will affect these indicators. She evaded the questions and did not identify any discernible health and welfare benefits from the new regulations. Bell concludes: “the apparent goal of the EPA’s current and proposed greenhouse gas regulations is to persuade the international community, particularly China, India, and other developing nations, to follow the Obama administration’s U.S. leadership over an economic precipice.” See link under EPA and other Regulators on the March

Secret Science: In *Forbes*, Geoffrey Kabat discusses EPA’s evasion of a House committee subpoena to produce data justifying EPA regulation of minute air particles (PM2.5, 2.5 micrometers). These regulations are based on two studies, the Harvard Six Cities Study (HSCS) and the American Cancer Society’s Cancer Prevention Study II (CPS II). Citing confidentiality, and other reasons, the EPA has refused to publish or allow public review of these studies. A separate study by Stanley Young and Jesse Xia of the National Institute for Statistical Sciences calls into question the validity of the two secret studies. There is no justification for basing regulations on secret studies, but such is science at the EPA. See links under EPA and other Regulators on the March

Fred Singer: Although he is traveling in Europe promoting the new NIPCC report, two articles appeared featuring SEPP Chairman S. Fred Singer. One is by him on Washington’s war on coal and the absurdity it involves. The second is an interview of him by Larry Bell on simplistic notions behind the claims of unprecedented sea level rise. See Articles # 1 and #2.

Heat Engine: Five-time IPCC expert reviewer has a basic tutorial on the climate system as a heat engine. Energy input is mainly short wave radiation from the sun. Energy output is mainly long wave radiation from every surface on the earth and from every level in the atmosphere, including clouds and aerosols. See link under Challenging the Orthodoxy.

Number of the Week: 0.065°C. In an amusing display of mathematics, Luboš Motl calculates that if the atmospheric warming is hiding in the ocean in the layer between 0 to 2000 meters (0-6560 feet), then it would have increased temperatures by 0.065°C (0.12 °F) since the 1960s. He reports that the Argo web site has an estimate of 0.06 °C since the 1960s, assuming the instruments can measure that precisely.

Commenting on the calculations, Judith Curry asks: “So, can anyone figure out why 0.06C is a big deal for the climate? Or how all that heat that is apparently well mixed in the ocean could somehow get into the atmosphere and influence weather/temperatures/rainfall on the land? Or is sequestering heat in the ocean a fortuitous ‘solution’ to the global (surface) warming problem?” See links under Changing Seas.

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see this week’s TWTW at: www.sepp.org. The articles are at the end of the pdf.

1. Report from the 'War on Coal'

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Sep 23, 2013

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/report_from_the_war_on_coal.html

2. Alarmists Are In Way Over Their Heads On Rising Ocean Claims

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Sep 24, 2013

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/09/24/alarmists-are-in-way-over-their-heads-on-rising-ocean-claims/>

3. Banning Demon Coal

The EPA wants to eliminate this major source of U.S. electric power.

Editorial, WSJ, Sep 24, 2013

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303759604579095292685100308.html?mod=W_SJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

4. It's a Cooked Book

Global warmism and the antiscientific method.

By James Taranto, WSJ, Sep 24, 2013

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304713704579095340714975708.html?mod=W_SJ_Opinion_MIDDLETopOpinion

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued

Two Minutes to Midnight

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Sep 24, 2013

<http://climateaudit.org/2013/09/24/two-minutes-to-midnight/#more-18392>

Suppressing Scientific Inquiry

Why We're Shutting Off Our Comments

Starting today, PopularScience.com will no longer accept comments on new articles. Here's why.

By Suzanne LaBarre, Popular Science, Sep 24, 2013 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-09/why-were-shutting-our-comments>

NIPCC Report

Heartland Institute climate change panel reveals science the UN suppresses

By Ron Arnold, Washington Examiner, Sep 27, 2013

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/heartland-institute-climate-change-panel-reveals-science-the-un-suppresses/article/2536480>

[SEPP Comment: Independent scientists would have been a more correct headline.]

Back at Ya, IPCC: 'Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science' (Part II)

By Paul Driessen, Master Resource, Sep 24, 2013

<http://www.masterresource.org/2013/09/climate-change-reconsidered-ii/#more-27714>

IPCC Report

IPCC: "We don't need no stinking climate sensitivity!"

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Sep 27, 2013

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2013/09/ipcc-we-dont-need-no-stinking-climate-sensitivity/>

MIT Climate Scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen Rips UN IPCC Report:

By Marc Morano, Climate Depot, Sep 28, 2013

<http://www.climatedepot.com/2013/09/28/mit-climate-scientist-dr-richard-lindzen-rips-un-ipcc-report-the-latest-ipcc-report-has-truly-sunk-to-level-of-hilarious-incoherence-it-is-quite-amazing-to-see-the-contortions-the-ipcc-has/>

New IPCC Climate Report Already Obsolete

By Patrick J. Michaels and Paul C. “Chip” Knappenberger, WUWT, Sep 27, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/27/new-ipcc-climate-report-already-obsolete-2/>

Thoughts on the SPM

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 27, 2013

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/27/thoughts-on-the-spm.html>

Band-aids Can't Fix the New IPCC Report

By Patrick Michaels and Paul Knappenberger, CATO, Sep 27, 2013

<http://www.cato.org/blog/band-aids-cant-fix-new-ipcc-report>

Reactions to IPCC AR5 Summary for Policy Makers

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 27, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/27/reactions-to-ipcc-ar5-summary-for-policy-makers/>

AR5 press cuttings

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 27, 2013

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/27/ar5-press-cuttings.html>

Climate panel set to reiterate bleakest of messages

Greenhouse gas emissions steaming ahead at 3 per cent a year

By John Gibbons, Irish Times, Sep 23, 2013 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.irishtimes.com/news/environment/climate-panel-set-to-reiterate-bleakest-of-messages-1.1536356?page=1>

The Climate-Change Circus

The IPCC's fifth assessment report is another politico-scientific document.

By Rupert Darwall, National Review Online, Sep 22, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.nationalreview.com/article/359034/climate-change-circus-rupert-darwall>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

The Real Climate

By Vincent Gray, SPPI, Sep 25, 2013

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/the_real_climate.html

ENSO and PDO Explain Tropical Average SSTs during 1950-2013

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Sep 26, 2013

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2013/09/enso-and-pdo-explain-tropical-average-ssts-during-1950-2013/>

The IPCC's belief that nature keeps the climate system energy-stabilized to better than 1 part in 1,000 is a matter of faith, not of physical “first principles”.

On Changing ENSO Conditions: The View from SSM/I

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, Sep 24, 2013

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2013/09/on-changing-enso-conditions-the-view-from-ssmi/>

Why the IPCC should never be taken seriously

By Des Moore, Quadrant, Sep 28, 2013

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2013/09/why-the-ipcc-can-t-be-taken-seriously>

When bad news is good

By Rud Istvan, Climate Etc. Sep 24, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/24/when-bad-news-is-good/>

Warming Plateau? Climatologists Face Inconvenient Truth

Data shows global temperatures aren't rising the way climate scientists have predicted. Now the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change faces a problem: publicize these findings and encourage skeptics -- or hush up the figures.

By Axel Bojanowski, Olaf Stampf and Gerald Traufetter, Spiegel, Sep 23, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

Trans: Ella Ornstein

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/climate-scientists-face-crisis-over-global-warming-pause-a-923937.html>

17 Year Warming Hiatus Causes Panic Cover Up. IPCC Duplicity Continues

By Tim Ball, A Different Perspective, Sep 22, 2013

<http://drtimball.com/2013/17-year-warming-hiatus-causes-panic-cover-up-ipcc-duplicity-continues/>

Research by a bureaucrat is almost guaranteed to be political, nowhere is that more evident than in the IPCC failures. It is exposed by the ugly fact that destroyed their hypothesis.

The Obama administration's unscientific war on carbon

By H. Leighton Stewart, Daily Caller, Sep 24, 2013

<http://dailycaller.com/2013/09/24/the-obama-administrations-unscientific-war-on-carbon/>

Defending the Orthodoxy

German Daily Die Welt: "Bureaucrats Refuse To Give Up Climate Catastrophe"... "Warming Much Less Than Expected"

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 26, 2013

<http://notrickszone.com/2013/09/26/german-daily-die-welt-bureaucrats-refuse-to-give-up-climate-catastrophe-warming-much-less-than-expected/>

IPCC AR5 WG1: preemptive indoctrination

Alarmist journalists already know how everyone will react and should react to an unknown report

By Luboš Motl, Reference Frame, Sep 22, 2013

<http://motls.blogspot.com/2013/09/ipcc-ar5-wg1-preemptive-indoctrination.html#more>

[SEPP Comment: Exposing the IPCC leaks to media it considers friendly.]

Time to Act on Climate Change

By Gina McCarthy, Huffington Post, Sep 20, 2013

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gina-mccarthy/time-to-act-on-climate-change_b_3954969.html

We know that carbon pollution is the most prevalent heat-trapping greenhouse gas, warming our planet and fueling climate change.

[SEPP Comment: By far, water vapor is the most important greenhouse gas.]

By Anne M Stark for LLNL News, Livermore CA (SPX), Sep 25, 2013

http://www.terraily.com/reports/Lawrence_Livermore_study_finds_human_activity_affects_vertical_structure_of_atmospheric_temperature_999.html

Access: The “leaked” IPCC AR5 draft Summary for Policymakers

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 23, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/23/access-the-leaked-ipcc-ar5-draft-summary-for-policymakers/>

Don't sweat fickleness, it's sun's fault or something in the water

Graham Lloyd, Australian, Sep 21, 2013 [H/t Stefan Björklund]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/dont-sweat-fickleness-its-suns-fault-or-something-in-the-water/story-e6frg6zo-1226723836623>

Climate sceptics claim warming pause backs their view

By Matt McGrath, BBC, Sep 25, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-24233643>

Global Warming Slowdown Hinders Climate Treaty Effort

By Alex Morales, Bloomberg, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-22/global-warming-slowdown-hinders-climate-treaty-effort.html>

[SEPP Comment: Why have a treaty?]

Hardly any experts doubt human-caused climate change

By John Cook, Australian, Sep 21, 2013 [H/t Stefan Björklund]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/hardly-any-experts-doubt-human-caused-climate-change/story-e6frg6zo-1226723829174>

Reforms urged to make UN climate reports shorter, more focused

By Alister Doyle, Reuters, Sep 24, 2013 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/24/us-climate-ipcc-idUSBRE98L0KD20130924?feedType=RSS&feedName=scienceNews&rpc=76>

[SEPP Comment: Typical propaganda photo of invisible carbon dioxide darkening the skies.]

We need to cool things down over climate change

It is surely past time to take matters out of the hands of the zealots – on both sides

Editorial, Telegraph, UK, Sep 26, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/10336853/We-need-to-cool-things-down-over-climate-change.html>

Questioning the Orthodoxy

The Climate-Industrial Complex

By Norman Rogers, American Thinker, Sep 27, 2013

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/the_climate-industrial_complex.html

Obama & Allies Tell UN to Cover for Lack of Global Warming

By Alex Newman, ICECAP, Sep 24, 2013

[http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/obama allies tell un to cover for lack of global warming/](http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/obama_allies_tell_un_to_cover_for_lack_of_global_warming/)

What was the IPCC AR4 Most Certain About?

By Roger Pielke Jr, His Blog, Sep 23, 2013

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2013/09/what-was-ipcc-ar4-most-certain-about.html>

[SEPP Comment: A review of “certainty” in the last report.]

Global Warming: The BIGGEST LIE Exposed

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Sep 21, 2013

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2013/09/global-warming-biggest-lie-exposed.html>

Time for some realism - but IPCC takes baby steps and in the end fails

By Staff Writer, ICECAP, Sep 27, 2013

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/time_for_some_realism/

Desperate times in climate alarmism

By Paul Driessen, WUWT, Sep 26, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/26/desperate-times-in-climate-alarmism/>

The IPCC Political-Suicide Pill

Politicians who legislate based on the IPCC’s increasingly flawed findings lose their jobs.

By Patrick Michaels, National Review, Sep 26, 2013 [H/t Cooler Heads]

<http://www.nationalreview.com/article/359556/ipcc-political-suicide-pill-patrick-j-michaels>

Time to end the climate of fear

By Lorrie Goldstein, Toronto Sun, Sep 27, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.torontosun.com/2013/09/26/time-to-end-the-climate-of-fear>

Problems in the Orthodoxy

Hans von Storch On Warming Pause: “...Fellow Scientists Are Very Hard-Pressed For An Explanation”

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 24, 2013

<http://notrickszone.com/2013/09/24/hans-von-storch-on-warming-pause-fellow-scientists-are-very-hard-pressed-for-an-explanation/>

[SEPP Comment: An account of a German radio broadcast including Hans von Storch, who is concerned about the failure of the globe to warm, and Environmental Minister Harry Lehmann, who produced a booklet pillorying skeptics.]

Seeking a Common Ground

Time for some realism

By Martin Livermore, Scientific Alliance, Sep 27, 2013

<http://scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/time-some-realism>

Climatology’s great dilemma

By Andrew Montford, The Spectator, Sep 23, 2013

<http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/2013/09/climatologys-great-dilemma/>

Five critical questions for the IPCC

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 24, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/24/five-critical-questions-for-the-ipcc/#more-13082>

Pause for Thought

By David Whitehouse, GWPF, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.thegwpf.org/pause-thought/>

[SEPP Comment: Exposing the inventing of excuses. If the current pause in temperature increases is caused by cyclical changes in natural influences, then would not similar cyclical changes have caused the late 20th century warming? The real failure in communication by the climate alarmists and the general press is the failure to address the lack of warming as it was becoming evident.]

Climate's big PR problem

By Margaret Wente, Global and Mail, Sep 24, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/commentary/climates-big-pr-problem/article14491748/>

BREAKING! IPCC responds - Josh 239

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 26, 2013

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/26/breaking-ipcc-responds-josh-239.html>

[SEPP Comment: A bit of humor emphasizing logical fallacies!]

Lowering Standards

95% (?)

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 27, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/27/95/>

The president of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences, Ralph Cicerone, and more than a dozen other scientists contacted by the AP said the 95 percent certainty regarding climate change is most similar to the confidence scientists have in the decades' worth of evidence that cigarettes are deadly.

[SEPP Comment: The once prestigious National Academy of Sciences.]

National Geographic rising sea level prophecy – cause for concern or absurd fairytale?

By Don Easterbrook, WUWT, Sep 25, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/25/national-geographic-rising-sea-level-prophecyc ause-for-concern-or-absurd-fairytale/>

Expanding the Orthodoxy

State Should Further Improve Its Reporting on Financial Support to Developing Countries to Meet Future Requirements and Guidelines

By Staff Writers, GAO, Sep 19, 2013 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-829>

Link to full report: Climate Change: State Should Further Improve Its Reporting on Financial Support to Developing Countries to Meet Future Requirements and Guidelines

By Staff Writers, GAO, Sep 2013

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657985.pdf>

[SEPP Comment: Total funding from FY 2010 to FY 2012 is \$7.457 Billion. 80% (\$6.1 Billion) for mitigation activities and 20% (\$1.4 Billion) for adaptation activities. Keep spending even though global warming has stopped!]

UN plans summit next year to boost odds of 2015 climate pact

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Sep 24, 2013

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/324297-un-plans-summit-next-year-to-boost-odds-of-2015-climate-pact>

Questioning European Green

The Crisis in UK Energy Policy has Arrived

By Peter Atherton and Mulu Sun, Liberum Capital, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.liberumcapital.com/pdf/AbwjyZrV.pdf>

Global Warming Alarmism Wrecks European Economy

By Jeffrey Collins, Real Clear Politics, Sep 23, 2013

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/23/global_warming_alarmism_wrecks_european_economy.html

Energy Companies Call for an End to Green Energy “Stealth Taxes”

By Tim Webb, The Times, Via GWPF, Sep 26, 2013

<http://www.thegwpf.org/energy-companies-call-green-energy-stealth-taxes/>

Germany's green dream is becoming a nightmare

Berlin urged to revise its energy policies as soaring costs threaten industry

By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, London Daily Telegraph, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.vancouversun.com/business/Germany+green+dream+becoming+nightmare/8946343/story.html>

Greens outraged over Polish 'clean coal' push at UN climate summit

By Staff Writers, EurActive, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.euractiv.com/energy/polish-coal-lobbying-climate-sum-news-530685>

Green deal is damp squib as only 12 homes take up energy-saving offer

The government's much-vaunted energy-saving scheme has been criticised as overly complex and expensive

By Harriet Meyer, The Guardian, Sep 21, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.theguardian.com/money/green-living-blog/2013/sep/22/green-deal-energy-saving-offer>

'The lights will go out over Britain': Shares in energy firms drop 5% amid warnings of blackouts from Miliband's plan to freeze bills

Miliband said he would 'fix power bills until 2017' if he won next election

But energy industry warns it will lead to gas and electricity shortages

Centrica's Sir Roger Carr called policy 'a recipe for economic ruin'

By James Chapman and Matt Chorley, Mail, UK, Sep 25, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2431073/Ed-Milibands-speech-revives-70s-socialism-Fixing-energy-prices-boosting-minimum-wage-.html>

Funding Issues

EU admits double-counting climate finance and development aid

By Arthur Neslen, EurActiv, Sep 20, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-un-development-goal/eu-admits-double-counting-climate-news-530583>

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?

IPCC emergency! Send in the philosophers

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, CA, Sep 25, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2013/09/25/peter-foster-send-in-the-philosophers/>

Bastardi's / Jung's Initial Winter Speculation Morphs Into "A Killer 2014-Winter Forecast" – Fear Spreads Across Europe

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 26, 2013

<http://notrickszone.com/2013/09/26/bastardis-jungs-initial-winter-speculation-morphs-into-a-killer-2014-winter-forecast-fear-spreads-across-europe/>

[SEPP Comment: A statement to the times.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.

ADMISSION!...German Delegation, Politician Concede: "Climate Policy Needs Element Of Fear" In IPCC Report

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Sep 23, 2013

<http://notrickszone.com/2013/09/23/admission-german-delegation-politician-concede-climate-policy-needs-element-of-fear-in-ipcc-report/>

Carbon cleanup would save millions of lives: study

By Staff Writers, Paris (AFP), Sept 22, 2013

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Carbon_cleanup_would_save_millions_of_lives_study_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Before the use of carbon based fuels to provide electricity, the average life span was far less than today!]

"Honey, I shrunk the consensus" — Monckton takes action on Cooks paper

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, Sep 24, 2013

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/09/monckton-honey-i-shrunk-the-consensus/#more-30815>

[SEPP Comment: The publication of the Cook et al. paper illustrates the low standards of the publisher!]

IPCC report: Britain could cool if Gulf Stream slows

Britain's climate could get cooler over the next 80 years, a major UN report on global warming is to suggest.

By Richard Gray, and Nick Collins, Telegraph, UK, Sep 26, 2013

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/10337064/IPCC-report-Britain-could-cool-if-Gulf-Stream-slows.html>

[SEPP Comment: What nonsense!]

World is Heading for a Heart Attack, UN Climate Expert Claims

By Ben Webster, The Times, Via GWPF, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.thegwpf.org/world-heading-heart-attack-climate-expert-claims/>

Models v. Observations

Not waving but drowning

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 23, 2013

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2013/9/23/not-waving-but-drowning.html>

New Book by Bob Tisdale: “Climate Models Fail”

By Bob Tisdale, WUWT, Sep 25, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/25/new-book-by-bob-tisdale-climate-models-fail/>

Model Issues

Lord Lawson calls for review of UK’s ‘flawed’ climate model

By Priyanka Shrestha, Energy Live, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.energylivenews.com/2013/09/23/lord-lawson-calls-for-review-of-uks-%E2%80%98flawed-climate-model/>

Link to paper: The Climate Model and the Public Purse

By Andrew Montford, GWPF, No Date [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2013/09/Montford-Climate-Model.pdf>

Nic Lewis vs the UK Met Office

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 25, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/25/nic-lewis-vs-the-uk-met-office/#more-13094>

Met Office concedes the error

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2013/9/25/met-office-concedes-the-error.html>

Link to the full responst:

<http://niclewis.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/slingo-letter-comments1.pdf>

Measurement Issues

Urban Heat Island - could it account for much of the century scale warming attributed to AGW?

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Sep 27, 2013

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/new-and-cool/urban_heat_island_could_it_account_for_most_warming_attributed_to_agw/

If we had continued with USHCN version 1, the 2000s would be the second warmest decade behind the 1930s.

[SEPP Comment: Whether intentional or not, the books have been cooked.]

Unwarranted Temperature Adjustments and Al Gore’s Unwarranted Call for Intellectual Tyranny

By Jim Steele, WUWT, Sep 25, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/25/unwarranted-temperature-adjustments-and-al-gores-unwarranted-call-for-intellectual-tyranny/#more-94616>

[SEPP Comment: More evidence of the Urban Heat Island effect and the inappropriate adjustments to the historic temperature record.]

Changing Climate

Ancient Forest Thaws From Melting Glacial Tomb

By Laura Poppick, Live Science, Sep 20, 2013 [H/t Ron Sundelin]

<http://www.livescience.com/39819-ancient-forest-thaws.html>

Drought Trends Across Canada

By Staff Writers, SPPI & CO2 Science, Sep 25, 2013

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/drought_trends_across_canada.html

Medieval Warm Period in Australia & New Zealand

By Staff Writers, SPPI & CO2 Science, Sep 25, 2013

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/medieval_warm_period_in_australia_a_new_zealand.html

Changing Seas

Ocean heat content: relentless but negligible increase

0.065 °C in 45 years

By Luboš Motl, Reference Frame, Sep 25, 2013

<http://motls.blogspot.com/2013/09/ocean-heat-content-relentless-but.html>

The relentless increase of ocean heat

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Sep 26, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/26/the-relentless-increase-of-ocean-heat/#more-13098>

Shell Game

By Rud Istvan, Climate Etc. Sep 26, 2013

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/26/shell-game/#more-13105>

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice

Antarctic sea ice hit 35-year record high Saturday

By Jason Samenow, Washington Post, Sep 23, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/capital-weather-gang/wp/2013/09/23/antarctic-sea-ice-hit-35-year-record-high-saturday/>

[SEPP Comment: If it had been reducing the headline would state the lowest every!]

Arctic Ocean Predicted To Be Ice Free By 2013 — Oops!

Editorial, IBD, Sep 24, 2013

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/092413-672356-arctic-ice-cap-grows-60-percent.htm?p=full>

Arctic ice melt slows down: NASA

By Staff Writers, Washington (AFP), Sept 21, 2013

http://www.terradaily.com/reports/Arctic_ice_melt_slows_down_NASA_999.html

[SEPP Comment: Trying to explain why last year's trend did not continue.]

The ice is not melting, yet still the scaremongers blunder on

The real global warming disaster: green taxes, a suicidal energy policy and wasting billions on useless windmills

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Sep 21, 2013

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/globalwarming/10324738/The-ice-is-not-melting-yet-still-the-scaremongers-blunder-on.html>

Acidic Waters

IPCC on acid – if they are virtually certain about ocean acidification, why does X-prize offer a reward for designing a proper ocean pH meter?

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 25, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/25/ipcc-on-acid-if-they-are-virtually-certain-about-ocean-acidification-why-does-x-prize-offer-a-reward-for-designing-a-proper-ocean-ph-meter/>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Modeling Temperature, Sea Level Pressure and Precipitation: CMIP5 vs. CMIP3

Reference: Bhend, J. and Whetton, P. 2013. Consistency of simulated and observed regional changes in temperature, sea level pressure and precipitation. *Climatic Change* 118: 799-810.
<http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/24sep2013a1.html>

Clearly, progress in climate modeling of this nature over the past several years has essentially been no progress at all.

The Outlook for Modeling Clouds (Adequately) ... is Still Cloudy

Reference: Lauer, A. and Hamilton, K. 2013. Simulating clouds with global climate models: A comparison of CMIP5 results with CMIP3 and satellite data. *Journal of Climate* 26: 3823-3845.
<http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/24sep2013a2.html>

Roots of Norway Spruce Trees Growing in CO2-Enriched Air

Reference: Pokorny, R., Tomaskova, I. and Marek, M.V. 2013. Response of Norway spruce root system to elevated atmospheric CO2 concentration. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum* 35: 1807-1816.
<http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/24sep2013a4.html>

As for the significance of their findings, Pokorny et al. write that "the finest roots showed the highest positive growth stimulation under elevated CO2 conditions," and they note that this phenomenon leads to a "larger root absorbing area per tree," which in turn leads to "better tree water supply under elevated CO2," with its attendant "higher chance to survive dry periods." And, of course, a larger root-absorbing area per tree also results in more nutrients being absorbed by the trees, which enables them to better cope under stressful environmental conditions.

Plastic Responses of a Marine Picoplankton to Ocean Acidification

Reference: Schaum, E., Rost, B., Millar, A.J. and Collins, S. 2013. Variation in plastic responses of a globally distributed picoplankton species to ocean acidification. *Nature Climate Change* 3: 298-302.

<http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/sep/25sep2013a3.html>

The four scientists conclude their work by stating that "as CO2 levels increase, *O. tauri* will grow and photosynthesize faster, and have larger cells with a higher C/N ratio than contemporary cells," with the result that "Ostreococcus, along with other green algae and cyanobacteria, are likely to increase in abundance in high-CO2 conditions" with concomitant benefits for the biosphere.

Litigation Issues

California's low-carbon fuel standard to stay

By Staff Writers, Sacramento (UPI), Sep 20, 2013

http://www.spacemart.com/reports/Californias_low-carbon_fuel_standard_to_stay_999.html

"If no such solution is found, California residents and people worldwide will suffer great harm. We will not at the outset block California from developing this innovative, non-discriminatory regulation to impede global warming," [Judge] Gould stated.

EPA and other Regulators on the March

What Is Really At Stake In The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subpoena Of EPA Data

By Geoffrey Kabat, Forbes, Sep 23, 2013

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/geoffreykabat/2013/09/23/what-is-really-at-stake-in-the-republican-partys-subpoena-of-epa-data/>

Link to paper: Assessing geographic heterogeneity and variable importance in an air pollution data set

By Stanley Young and Jessie Xia, Statistical Analysis and Data Mining

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sam.11202/abstract>

EPA Head Admits Being Clueless About Any Obama Climate Plan Benefits

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Sep 22, 2013

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/09/22/epa-head-admits-being-clueless-about-any-obama-climate-plan-benefits/>

[SEPP Comment: Clueless is an incorrect term. She is very clever and manipulative.]

It's Only the Beginning

By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 27, 2013

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2013/09/27/its-only-the-beginning/>

EPA Proposes Revised Carbon Standards for New Power Plants (UPDATED)

By Sonal Patel, Power News, Sep 20, 2013

http://www.powermag.com/epa-proposes-revised-carbon-standards-for-new-power-plants/?hq_e=el&hq_m=2753584&hq_l=6&hq_v=9a83fe854e&hq_e=el&hq_m=2753957&hq_l=3&hq_v=5e660500d0

Former EPA general counsel Martella discusses agency's legal rationale for new source proposal

Transcript by Staff Writer, EETV, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.eenews.net/tv/videos/1729/transcript>

[SEPP Comment: To the courts, the process is important, not the substance.]

EPA won't require carbon trapping for existing power plants

By Julian Hattem, The Hill, Sep 23, 2013

<http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/energyenvironment/323895-epa-power-plant-rule-wont-include-controversial-provision>

[SEPP Comment: We do not know that. Will EPA do the slow kill, and prevent major improvements?]

EPA Foils Clean Fuel

By Howard Richman, Raymond Richman, and Jesse Richman, American Thinker, Sep 23, 2013

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/epa_foils_clean_fuel.html

[SEPP Comment: Driving up the cost of using compressed natural gas in automobiles.]

Obama Appeals to Trout Fishermen on Power-Plant Pollution

By Mark Drajem, Bloomberg, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-25/obama-appeals-to-trout-fishermen-on-power-plant-pollution.html>

Energy Issues – Non-US

Cost of energy hammers EU industry

By Guy Bentley, City AM, Sep 25, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.cityam.com/blog/1380120004/cost-energy-hammers-eu-industry>

How Europe's Economy Is Being Devastated By Global Warming Orthodoxy

By Jim Powell, Forbes, Sep 19, 2013

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jimpowell/2013/09/19/how-europes-economy-is-being-devastated-by-global-warming-orthodoxy/>

Energy Issues -- US

'Blowing Smoke' at Obama CO2 Policy: POWER's Peltier Retires in High Style

By Robert Peltier, Master Resource, Sep 27, 2013

<http://www.masterresource.org/2013/09/obama-smoke-co2-policy/#more-27594>

Carbon Gauntlet Book Description

By Donn Dears, Power for USA, Sep 24, 2013

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2013/09/24/carbon-gauntlet-book-description/>

EIA: Gas-Fired Generation Falls from 2013 Levels But Still High

By Thomas Overton, Power News, Sep 25, 2013

http://www.powermag.com/eia-gas-fired-generation-falls-from-2013-levels-but-still-high/?hq_e=el&hq_m=2753584&hq_l=12&hq_v=9a83fe854e&hq_e=el&hq_m=2753957&hq_l=18&hq_v=5e660500d0

Washington's Control of Energy

Unwelcome Milestone for Keystone XL

By Jack Gerard, Energy Tribune, Sep 25, 2013

<http://www.energytribune.com/79269/unwelcome-milestone-for-keystone-xl#sthash.5mwOh1P7.dpbs>

[SEPP Comment: Five years since application for permits.]

Obama vows to protect 'free flow' of Middle East oil

By Ben Geman, The Hill, Sep 24, 2013

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/324189-obama-us-will-ensure-the-free-flow-of-middle-east-oil-to-the-world>

[SEPP Comment: Why not protect the free flow of oil from Canada, by approving the Keystone pipeline?]

Federal Mandarinate Decrees End to Coal

The mindless EPA has taken us back to 1970.

By William Tucker, American Spectator, Sep 27, 2013

<http://spectator.org/archives/2013/09/27/federal-mandarinate-decrees-en>

New Rules On Power Plants Will Kill Coal Industry

Editorial, IBD, Sep 20, 2013

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/092013-671984-epa-rules-will-send-energy-costs-up-sharply.htm>

Day 7: Obama refuses to follow the law on nuclear waste

By Conn Carroll, Washington Examiner, Sep 24, 2013

http://washingtonexaminer.com/day-7-obama-refuses-to-follow-the-law-on-nuclear-waste/article/2536277?utm_source=Washington%20Examiner:%20Opinion%20Digest%20Reoccurring%20-%2009/25/2013&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Washington%20Examiner:%20Opinion%20Digest

Emissions regulations are central battle in Obama climate agenda

By Julian Hattam and Ben Goad, The Hill, Sep 23, 2013

<http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/energyenvironment/323785-new-emissions-regulations-are-central-battle-in-obama-climate-agenda>

No 'Incredibly Small' Wars Against Energy by Obama

By Marita Noon, Townhall, Sep 22, 2013

http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/maritanoon/2013/09/22/no-incredibly-small-wars-against-energy-by-obama-n1706440?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Shale pits environmental versus economic interests

By Staff Writers, Paris (AFP), Sept 24, 2013

http://www.oilgasdaily.com/reports/Shale_pits_environmental_versus_economic_interests_999.html

Return of King Coal?

The United States is a developing nation and coal is its foundational fuel

By Frank Clemente, Energy Facts Weekly, Sep 24, 2013

<http://us1.campaign-archive1.com/?u=29bc7d5d85828d574f86c157a&id=ebf45f6aa1&e=>

Nuclear Energy and Fears

End of Atomic Age Seen as Merkel's Biggest Headache Now

By Stefan Nicola, Bloomberg, Sep 24, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-23/end-of-atomic-age-seen-as-merkel-s-biggest-headache-now.html>

IAEA Issues Projections for Nuclear Power from 2020 to 2050

By Staff Writers, IAEA, Sep 24, 2013

<http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/2013/np2020.html>

[SEPP Comment: Slow growth.]

Carbon Schemes

Norway abandons Mongstad carbon capture plans

By Staff Writers, BBC, Sep 20, 2013

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24183443>

[SEPP Comment: So much for EPA's McCarthy's claims of a proven technology.]

California Dreaming

Will the U.K. Repeat California's Energy Disaster?

By Marc Champion, Bloomberg, Sep 24, 2013 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-24/will-the-u-k-repeat-california-s-energy-disaster.html>

Other Scientific News

Environmental Satellites:

Focused Attention Needed to Improve Mitigation Strategies for Satellite Coverage Gaps

Statement by David Powner, pownerd@gao.gov, GAO, Sep 19, 2013

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-865T>

Full Statement:

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657954.pdf>

[SEPP Comment: High potential gap in timely deployment of satellites, which can endanger public health and safety.]

Geostationary Weather Satellites:

Progress Made, but Weaknesses in Scheduling, Contingency Planning, and Communicating with Users Need to Be Addressed

Contact: David Powner, pownerd@gao.gov, GAO, Sep 9, 2013

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-597>

Link to Full Report: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657516.pdf>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Clean energy least costly to power America's electricity needs

By Staff Writers, Heidelberg, Germany (SPX), Sep 24, 2013

[http://www.energy-](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Clean_energy_least_costly_to_power_Americas_electricity_needs_999.html)

[daily.com/reports/Clean_energy_least_costly_to_power_Americas_electricity_needs_999.html](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Clean_energy_least_costly_to_power_Americas_electricity_needs_999.html)

[SEPP Comment: Complete nonsense!]

Study: The Late Cretaceous Period was likely ice-free

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Sep 26, 2013

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/26/study-the-late-cretaceous-period-was-likely-ice-free/>

[SEPP Comment: The article attempts to make a blame CO2 for the warm period. However, the positioning of the continents makes an analogy impossible.]

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Report from the 'War on Coal'

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Sep 23, 2013

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/report_from_the_war_on_coal.html

A major project has been quietly underway, within the executive branch of the U.S. government, trying to calculate a "social cost of carbon" (SCC) -- a so-called "non-market externality" (i. e., not captured by the normal price system of a free market). This calculated cost would then be imposed on all government programs in order to "fix" the price system -- so they say.

The SCC report was published in May 2013, with little fanfare; public comments had to be submitted by Sept. 16. But this whole misconceived exercise has no valid scientific basis and can destroy the supply of low-cost, reliable electric power. It is certain to face legal challenges from industry and informed consumer groups; it should be abandoned.

Even the terminology is confusing. The interagency SCC group, made up of the top brains from about a dozen departments, cannot even define their terms properly. What they label "cost" is the damage (disbenefit) of a hypothesized global warming, supposedly caused by atmospheric carbon

dioxide (CO₂). These imagined disbenefits will eventually be compared with the better-defined real cost of controlling CO₂ emissions in the United States -- a kind of benefit-cost analysis.

This control cost, of course, translates into higher energy prices, which will make life extremely difficult for lower-income groups. Such a carbon tax creates more poverty, and will cause businesses and jobs to flee to other countries where conditions are more hospitable.

Other countries

Aware of this issue, Australia not only has just decided to scrap its tax on carbon emissions, but is proceeding to dismantle its whole climate apparatus. Europe may likewise abandon its CO₂ goals, which had been laboriously negotiated by bureaucrats of the European Union. We will get some inkling of what happens in Germany from their forthcoming federal elections. Here, however, is a typical comment from the British Parliament:

Does my hon. Friend agree that the Climate Change Act is without doubt the most foolish piece of statute that any of us here is likely to see in Parliament? Does he further agree that the very principle of unilaterally re-embarking on a crash programme of carbon reduction can only have the effect of exporting our energy-intensive industries to places where they may emit more carbon, and that carbon reduction will have only a nugatory effect on the problem because, as he correctly states, the Chinese are increasing carbon emissions faster than we are succeeding in reducing them? --Andrew Tyrie MP, [House of Commons, 10 September 2013](#).

IPCC vs. NIPCC

There is always hope that the U.S. will follow these examples -- even as the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), the U.N.'s climate science panel, issues its fifth Assessment Report, proclaiming its members' increasing certainty (66% in 2001, 90% in 2007, and more than 95% in 2013) in the existence of AGW (anthropogenic global warming) -- while temperatures have not shown any warming trend for more than 17 years -- even as CO₂ keeps on rising.

The just released report of the NIPCC (Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change) explains its rationale as follows: *Climate Change Reconsidered-II* is a counter to IPCC's reliance on unvalidated climate models rather than observations, and IPCC's selective use of data, ignoring evidence that disagrees with AGW, their preferred conclusion.

EPA's war on coal plants

Unfortunately, in the U.S., the EPA seems to be moving in the opposite direction, trying to repeat and even outdo Europe's near-fatal errors:

1. The EPA is issuing greenhouse gas (GHG) performance standards for new coal and natural gas-fired electric generating units (EGUs). The EPA's proposed standards for coal-fired EGUs are expected to require untested "carbon capture and storage" (CCS) technology. [The EPA's justification for these highly aggressive standards is expected to rely heavily on the Kemper County IGCC facility in Mississippi, which is still under construction and not expected to begin operation and tests until next spring.]
2. These proposed standards are not appropriate under the Clean Air Act (CAA), which provides that performance standards must reflect "the best system of emission reduction, which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental

impact and energy requirements) the [EPA] Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated."

A CCS-based standard is not the "best system of emission Reduction" under this language because:

- (a) Kemper is not even running yet, and so its performance level has not been demonstrated;
- (b) Kemper could not have been built without significant government support; and
- (c) Kemper has access to enhanced oil recovery sites where the captured CO₂ can be injected, whereas coal-fired EGUs built in other areas of the country will not be located near such sites and will not be able to store CO₂ -- unless significant new storage sites and pipelines are developed and a permitting and legal liability system put in place.

3. The EPA's aggressive standards for *new* units create significant concern that the EPA will adopt comparably aggressive standards for *existing* units. Although the EPA is not expected to require CCS-based standards for existing units, the EPA is expected to adopt minimum requirements that can be met only by either retiring existing coal units or reducing their hours of operation. This approach could lead to significant stranded investment. Utilities around the country, in response to other EPA regulations, have been forced to install very expensive pollution-control technology on their existing units. Unless these units can run as intended, this investment cannot be fully amortized.

4. The CAA (Clean Air Act) does not give the EPA authority to dictate existing-source performance standards. Unlike for new units, where the EPA promulgates standards that apply directly to sources, the states, not the EPA, adopt existing-source performance standards. Under Section 111(d) of the CAA, the EPA has authority to issue regulations calling for states to adopt plans that contain performance standards. The states themselves, however, promulgate the performance standards.

The EPA claims that it has authority to issue guidelines setting forth minimum requirements and has recently said that those guidelines will be "binding" on the states. Eighteen state attorneys general, however, have written a White Paper that expresses the legal opinion that states retain ultimate power to decide how stringent the standards must be.

SCC calculations of disbenefits

Returning to the SCC calculations of disbenefits, which of course would occur very much later than the actual costs of CO₂ mitigation, much of the debate has involved the topic of proper discount rate. (This debate is of some importance in its own right; a choice of 2 percent results in large disbenefits, while the choice of 7 percent [the value recommended by the OMB] reduces the "present value" of disbenefits to near zero and makes any attempts at CO₂ mitigation look ridiculous.)

Seasoned economists like Yale Prof. William Nordhaus argue for a value of 4 percent, a kind of compromise. Meanwhile, in Great Britain, the report by Lord Nicholas Stern had used a discount rate close to zero -- backing the political position of former prime minister Tony Blair to control CO₂.

The SSC report of May 2013 determined that the price of carbon (actually, of CO₂) should be \$36 per ton. (SCC computer models vary in their estimates of the correct social cost -- i.e., carbon prices -- from \$12 to \$129 in the year 2020.) Electricity from wind would then be cheaper than electricity generated by coal -- a complete distortion of economic reality. As Donn Dears's blog

reminds us, the DOE and EPA introduced this new price when establishing guidelines for microwave ovens (!) -- but no one noticed. There were no public hearings.

The interagency SSC panel seems to have latched on to sea level rise (SLR) as another source of major disbenefits. Unfortunately for them, they are, again, wrong about the science -- and so are many IPCC scientists who haven't studied the matter. There is absolutely no evidence that GH warming, lasting only decades or even centuries, will speed up SLR. As measured by tide gauges, sea level seems to be rising at about 7 inches per century, no matter what we do -- completely independent of the level of atmospheric carbon dioxide or of global temperatures of the past centuries.

A crucial question

In this debate about discount rate and all of the details of the disbenefits, the interagency SCC panel seems to have lost sight of the main point: *Wouldn't both a warmer climate and increased CO₂ produce positive net benefits rather than just (negative) disbenefits?* This seems to be the position of a group of 23 credible economists, who looked at the question sector by sector and found that a modest warming and higher CO₂ levels would increase GDP -- mainly by improving agricultural yields.

This is not rocket science. It is well-known that higher CO₂ levels promote more rapid and better growth of crops and that a warmer climate will lengthen the growing season and reduce frosts that kill fruit trees.

Of course, we are talking about *net* benefits. The season for ski resorts may become shorter, but the beach season will become longer. And would a colder climate really be better than a somewhat warmer one? We merely note that people from North Dakota choose to move to Palm Springs in California, and New Englanders tend to move to sunny Florida, especially in the winter.

One concludes that the White House's war on coal, our cheapest and most plentiful fuel for electric generation, is totally misplaced. Carbon dioxide is a global constituent of the atmosphere -- and there is no way that the EPA can control emissions from China or India or other developing countries that wish to produce more electricity to provide a better way of life for their populations.

It is telling that in this war to destroy the U.S.'s capacity to generate low-cost, reliable electricity, the EPA relies on the Clean Air Act of 1970, which mandates that the EPA set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Ignoring this crucial part of the Act, the EPA has never promulgated a NAAQS for CO₂, doesn't even know how to calculate it, and certainly could never enforce such a global value.

2. Alarmists Are In Way Over Their Heads On Rising Ocean Claims

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Sep 24, 2013

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/09/24/alarmists-are-in-way-over-their-heads-on-rising-ocean-claims/>

[SEPP Comment: Interview with Fred Singer]

I have asked my very good friend Dr. Fred Singer to comment about the latest U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers report with particular regard to their most recent sea level rise projections. Dr. Singer is an expert in remote sensing measurements, having served as founding director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service,

vice chair of the U.S. National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, deputy assistant administrator for policy at the EPA, and as a reviewer for several of the IPCC reports. He is an elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Geophysical Union, the American Physical Society, and the American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics.

Fred is a professor emeritus at the University of Virginia, and directs the Science & Environment Policy Project which has produced a series of scientific Non-Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (NICPP) report studies which often take issue with IPCC conclusions. NICPP's new publication "Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science" is available at no cost on-line.

Fred, it's obvious that the IPCC has got lots of 'splainin' to do about how their previous global warming doomsday predictions based upon hypothetical computer models they claimed to have confidence in got it so wrong. That won't be easy. Political operatives at their upcoming damage-control meeting in Stockholm this week will have to figure out how to spin evidence of a 17 year "pause" in global temperature rise and the expanding Arctic ice mass despite what they love to describe as "record high" atmospheric CO₂ concentrations.

Few would care about any of these climate crisis capers at all, were it not for the epic climate science budget bonanza rising ocean scare. The simplified, dumbed-down story packaged and distributed for the public goes like this:

- **Evil carbon dioxide from human fossil burning is heating the climate to unprecedented levels.**
- **This is causing glaciers to melt and sea levels to rise at an accelerating and disastrous rate.**
- **The salvation of our planet depends upon an immediate transition to wind and solar energy, electric cars and bicycles, and less consumption-oriented lifestyles.**

Is everything really that simple?

Larry, no, reality is a good deal more complex than that. First of all, the accelerated warming that was forecast to produce catastrophic sea level rise flooding Bangladesh and Pacific islands causing hundreds of millions of refugees to flee coastal regions hasn't occurred. This isn't to say either that the planet hasn't been warming, or that sea levels haven't risen. Of course they have, although these are hardly new developments. I can also make an argument that rising sea levels and warming periods may be somewhat disconnected matters.

Let's understand that the world's mean temperatures have been rising at a pretty constant rate of about one degree Fahrenheit (0.6°C) over the past 100 years, and is likely to continue, although with both warmer and cooler fluctuations, for many hundreds of years into the future. Over each of the past several centuries, including the last one, sea levels rose by about 7 inches (18 cm).

Accordingly, neither the overall warming trend or sea level rise began with the fossil-burning Industrial Revolution... nor have they changed in any detectable way due to human influences. And we can't even really know that the second follows the first. Sea levels rose during the Little Ice Age from about 1400-1859 AD... a period which was considerably colder than now.

Incidentally, do you remember when presidential candidate Obama declared during his June 8, 2008 victory speech as Democratic Party nominee that his presidency will be "the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal"? Well although some tidal gauge data does show deceleration, since it started in 1960, the year he was conceived, he probably can't take full credit for that.

There are proxy records, including organic and ocean sediment data, that provide a picture of past temperatures. But how can we really know the history of sea level changes dating back hundreds of years, or even during recent times?

Larry, tidal station gauges have been in existence for a century now, and as I mentioned earlier, the measured rate of sea level rise has been quite constant, about 18 cm per century. We can also get some picture of temperature and sea level changes over past millennia by looking at melting shrinkage rates of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet. This can be determined by noting how much its "grounding line", the points where it makes contact with the underlying land mass, has receded. Unlike floating sea ice which doesn't influence sea level when it melts, the West Antarctic Ice Sheet is part of the land mass. When it melts, it adds to sea level just as melting glaciers do.

The end of the last Ice Age 18,000 years ago caused the sea level to rise by a huge amount...about 400 feet. This change happened rapidly at first, caused primarily by the melting of huge ice sheets covering North America and Eurasian land masses which disappeared about 8000-5000 years ago.

The West Antarctic Ice sheet began to melt at that time also, but at a much slower rate, and that melting continues today. We might expect this melting to continue until it is gone in another 7,000 years or so... or until the next Ice Age, whichever comes first. Other smaller ice sheets that once existed in the Antarctic are already gone. The oceans will continue to rise, despite anything President Obama may attempt in order to stop them.

Fred, you said earlier that we can't necessarily correlate warmer temperatures with sea level rise...yet you did just attribute continued melting since the last Ice Age to dramatic ocean rise. Isn't this inconsistent?

Larry, it would be if it was all really that simple. However much depends upon other influences and the time scales involved. It's one thing if warmer temperatures persist for millennia. In that case, the West Antarctic Ice Sheet melting rate will increase, and so will the sea level increase rate. On the other hand, short term warming fluctuations lasting decades or less are a different matter.

This is where some other influences come into play. One big one involves changes in Antarctic ice accumulation which actually comes about due to warming and other causes that lower sea level by transferring water from the ocean to land mass. Another is thermal expansion of oceans due to warming. Still another involves changes in coastal and subsea land surface elevations that influence and complicate reliable sea level measurements.

Then on top of all that, there are erratic and unpredictable glacier changes that are influenced by a host of different natural factors. [A study reported in the May 2012 issue of Science](#) examined 200 of them across the Greenland continent between 2000-2010 using radar data collected from synthetic aperture satellites. It found that their individual flow rates varied both in location and time.

Glaciers with growth rates that were accelerating during a few years, decelerated in others. Some accelerating glaciers were in proximity to others that were decelerating. Their individual behaviors were thought to be influenced by a variety of factors, including: fjord, glacier, and bed geometry; local climate; and small-scale ocean water flow and terminus sea ice conditions. Overall, melting speed-ups were much lower than IPCC models projected.

Again, regarding temperature influences upon sea levels, consider, for example, what happened when the global climate sharply warmed between 1920 and 1940. Data shows that the sea level

actually rose during that period, and then accelerated after temperatures cooled. How can this happen? One important clue is that a warming ocean evaporates more water, and a lot of it rains out in polar regions, transferring that water to the ice caps. This produces a net sea level lowering influence, counteracting the rising influences of glacier melts and ocean thermal expansion.

The Antarctic continent has been gaining ice accumulation. This might well suggest that between 1920 and 1940, ocean water thermal expansion and mountain glacier melting were less important to sea level than ice accumulation on the Antarctic continent. Unfortunately, the science is not advanced enough to be certain, and reliable data on ice accumulation over the whole Antarctic continent have not been available.

Fred, what about sea level data? How accurate is that?

There are some considerable problems and uncertainties regarding the ways we collect that data. To do this we use two different methods, tidal gauges and satellite measurements. Much of my particular expertise involves the latter.

There are about two dozen tidal gauge stations in the world, with data going back to the early 1900s which have been used by international tidal gauge network in Liverpool, England. These stations measure relative sea level with respect to coastal land surface. A big problem is that ever since the melting of glacial ice cover from northern continents over several millennia, the land surface has rebounded in some places...a process called "isostatic adjustment". This is like what a mattress does when you get out of bed, only a whole lot slower. At the same time, many tidal stations have been sinking due to coastal subsidence caused by depletion of groundwater...yes, by humans... that has led to compaction of sediments.

Sea level satellite observations date back only to 1993, which is a very short time to draw trend conclusions. Whereas tidal stations measure the sea level relative to coastal land surface, satellites measure "absolute" sea level independent of vertical coastal surface changes. In this regard, satellites have an inherent advantage over tidal stations, but the figures don't match up.

So then, how does IPCC arrive at its alarmist conclusions?

When in doubt, and they always are, they just make them up based upon hypothetical models that have yet to comply with observed conditions. And as for those models, it's important to realize that no overall sea level change theory encompassing thermal expansion of oceans, melting of mountain glaciers, and changes, both positive and negative, of Greenland and Antarctic sheets even exists.

A leading researcher, Bruce Douglas, termed all of this a "puzzle", while famed Scripps Institute oceanographer Walter Munk calls it an "enigma". Perhaps it's like Churchill's description of Soviet Russia, "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma".

In any case, let's review what IPCC has projected in their Summary for Policymakers reports crafted for prime time media audiences:

- *The first assessment report (1990) showed a rising sea level range of 10-367 cm by the year 2100. That's some range!*
- *The second report (1996) narrowed the range to 3-124 cm by 2100.*
- *The third report (2001) showed the range to be 11-77 cm by 2100.*
- *The fourth report (2007) originally showed 14-43 cm in draft...then changed it to 18-59 cm in final printed version.*

The good news here, if there really is any, is that each of the successive summary report maximum estimates decreased, all being much smaller than the 600 cm sea level rise trumpeted by former NASA Goddard Institute for Space Science activist James Hansen and climate multi-millionaire Gore.

A draft of the IPCC's 5th report that was leaked to the press now projects a sea level rise by 2100 of 45-110 cm (16-40 inches) ...about double of what they showed six years ago. What is particularly remarkable about this is that the report shows zero sea rise values before 1880, while the coral data and coastal sediments do.

Tidal gauge data show no acceleration during strong warming between 1920-40 (a period when CO₂ concentrations were lower)...with levels continuing to rise during slight cooling of 1940-75, and also during a recent 17-year warming "pause". Yet IPCC-2013 shows increasing values (acceleration) throughout the entire period. It appears that this record may have been falsified.

How did IPCC arrive at their projections?

They compiled the 1996 data from three sources:

- *Thermal expansion of warming oceans was assumed to contribute about 4 cm.*
- *Melting of continental glaciers was credited for about 3.5 cm.*
- *Polar region ice accumulations (a net lowering from water transfer from oceans) was also estimated.*

Altogether, these three contributions would only account for about 20 percent of the observed 18 cm rise since 1900...so what is missing? If it is surmised from the absence of observed acceleration during 1920-40, then ice accumulation roughly balances thermal expansion and contributions from melting glaciers. On that basis, why is the sea level rising at all?

So Fred, what is the answer? If global warming actually lowers the sea level that some are so worried about, and we can help that along by burning more coal and other fossils, should we start doing so right away to save Venice residents and tourists from drowning?

No Larry. That's really not my point here. I only wish to offer a modest appeal for the public and politicians to take note that better, more honest and objective science is needed, to be wary about motives and claims of U.N. climate treaty negotiators, and to understand that draconian regulatory limits upon energy use will not quell rising tides.

Having said this, there are many serious issues that do warrant a great deal more study. Included are regional and local effects and adaptations associated with isostatic changes, land subsidence, ocean currents, wind patterns and other factors. More efforts are also needed to harmonize conflicting data from tidal gauges and direct measurements of ocean surface by satellites.

Thanks Fred. In other words, let's keep our heads above the water line and not get too feverish about what we hear from IPCC. After all, even Al Gore seems to have changed his mind about the threat. In his *An Inconvenient Truth* film, didn't he feature an animation depicting a sudden global-warming-induced break-up of the Antarctic Peninsula's Larson-B ice shelf in 2002, suggesting that the entire Greenland Ice Sheet might suffer the same fate during this century?

But if he was still really worried, why would he risk making an underwater investment in a big \$9 million ocean-view villa in Montecito, California?

3. Banning Demon Coal

The EPA wants to eliminate this major source of U.S. electric power.

Editorial, WSJ, Sep 24, 2013

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303759604579095292685100308.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

One mystery of U.S. politics is why Al Gore, California billionaire Tom Steyer and the green lobby view President Obama as a disaster for global warming. Maybe nobody could satisfy their ambitions. But the reality is that the White House is gradually enacting their anticarbon agenda through regulation.

Mr. Steyer and the rest notched another victory Friday as the Environmental Protection Agency imposed a de facto ban on new coal-fired electric power. The rule does not yet apply to existing coal plants that still provide about 40% of U.S. electricity, though that day will come soon. The meaning of Friday's rule is that the EPA is banning coal—the second largest source of carbon emissions after petroleum—from the future energy mix.

The EPA admits as much in the 463-page document, noting that "few, if any" plants will be built "in the foreseeable future." For this reason, "the EPA projects that this proposed rule will result in negligible CO₂ emission changes, quantified benefits, and costs by 2022." Got that? The EPA is conceding that it has shut down coal development for at least the next decade, even if that doesn't reduce carbon emissions.

EPA chief Gina McCarthy nonetheless felt it politically necessary to disown the regulatory war on coal that she is obviously waging. At a breakfast this week she argued that the economics of coal power are bad because low gas prices have made coal "not really the fuel of choice" and that the new rule won't have "a significant immediate impact."

But then why issue the rule at all in return for "negligible" benefits? Probably because she and the shrewder environmentalists know that the fuel is still viable and might rebound if natural gas prices rise. The EPA is guaranteeing that won't happen.

The rule creates a 1,100-pound limit per megawatt hour on carbon, while even the most modern, advanced coal plants put out 1,800 pounds or more. New plants could theoretically install carbon capture and sequestration technologies (CCS) to get below the EPA's carbon ceiling, but it will be impossible for utilities to finance new projects with these unproven systems that require billions of dollars of capital investment. That's why the EPA estimates the rule will have "negligible" economic costs as well.

The law requires the EPA to certify that the technology the agency mandates be proven and demonstrated in practice, but there are only two CCS projects now under construction—in Kemper County, Mississippi and Saskatchewan, Canada. Others are merely on the drawing board. When questioned last week about Kemper's budget overruns despite federal subsidies, Ms. McCarthy admitted the project isn't "really a good model" because it is "actually very unique."

These and other legal ambiguities mean the coal ban will be litigated for years. EPA first proposed this rule in April 2012, then withdrew it to add more legal armor-plating (and get past the election) when even the EPA's allies said it wouldn't survive judicial scrutiny.

Next year the EPA will propose a rule to impose vast new anticarbon costs on existing plants in a bid to eliminate what remains of coal power. The target after that will be natural gas, and anything else that emits the demon carbon.

4. It's a Cooked Book

Global warmism and the antiscientific method.

By James Taranto, WSJ, Sep 24, 2013

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304713704579095340714975708.html?mod=W_SJ_Opinion_MIDDLETopOpinion

In the first five paragraphs of a recent dispatch from Stockholm, the Associated Press--in our estimation unwittingly, for the most part--exposes the deep corruption of the "global warming" enterprise:

Scientists working on a landmark U.N. report on climate change are struggling to explain why global warming appears to have slowed down in the past 15 years even though greenhouse gas emissions keep rising.

Leaked documents obtained by The Associated Press show there are deep concerns among governments over how to address the issue ahead of next week's meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Climate skeptics have used the lull in surface warming since 1998 to cast doubt on the scientific consensus that humans are cooking the planet by burning fossil fuels and cutting down CO₂-absorbing forests.

The IPCC report is expected to affirm the human link with greater certainty than ever, but the panel is under pressure to also address the recent lower rate of warming, which scientists say is likely due to heat going deep into the ocean and natural climate fluctuations.

"I think to not address it would be a problem because then you basically have the denialists saying, 'Look the IPCC is silent on this issue,' " said Alden Meyer, of the Washington-based Union of Concerned Scientists.

The first paragraph describes a scientific problem: a theory that has been put to an empirical test and found wanting. In the fourth paragraph, we get a passing discussion of alternative hypotheses. But this is presented as fundamentally a problem of political communication or public relations.

And these guys look shifty not just for scientists but for PR men. Specialists in crisis management emphasize the importance of building (or rebuilding) public trust by being both honest and forthcoming. But look at that Meyer quote. He's not calling for forthrightness, just for some sort of statement so that critics--whom he disparages as "denialists"--can't say the IPCC "is silent."

The AP itself uses the term "climate skeptics," which is less pointed than "denialists" but is still problematic. The purported opposition between "skeptics" and adherents to "the scientific consensus" is nonsensical, for skepticism is at the very heart of the scientific method. When the data call a theory into question, a scientist revisits the theory. Instead, the panel is employing the antiscientific method: It "is expected to affirm" the theory "with greater certainty than ever."

And look how the AP sums up that theory: "that humans are cooking the planet by burning fossil fuels and cutting down CO2-absorbing forests." That's science fiction, not science. If Damon Knight were still with us, he might observe of the IPCC report: "It's a cooked book."

Meanwhile, a BBC story on the forthcoming report quotes this enthusiastic endorsement from Arthur Petersen, a Dutch climate scientist: "It is a major feat that we have been able to produce such a document which is such an adequate assessment of the science. That being said, it is virtually unreadable!"

And London's Daily Telegraph quotes Tony Blair, a former British prime minister, as saying in New York: "After this panel assessment this week, there will no longer be any serious doubt in the minds of serious people that this is a serious problem."

Manbearpig may be super serial, but the key Blair phrase is "serious people." Perhaps you recognize the logical fallacy. If not, here's a hint: Although Tony Blair was born in Edinburgh, his father was English and his mother was Irish.

#####