Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

THANK YOU FOR LOOKING INTO ENVIRONMENTAL & CLIMATE IMPACTS THAT AFFECTS ONE & ALL
AS ONE WHO HAS A SHORT LIFE EXPECTANCY - NOT RELATED TO POLLUTANTS - I AM CONCERNED WHAT & HOW THE ACTIONS OF THE PEOPLE HAVE TO THE FUTURE OF WHAT MANY TAKE FOR GRANTED
I SO HOPE THIS COMMITTEE MAKES A STAND WITHIN THE U.S. AS A STATE THAT WILL NOT TOLERATE THE OBSTRUCTION OF THE BEAUTY OF THE LAND & WATERS, NOT ONLY THIS STATE HAS, BUT BE A FOREFRONT TO OTHER STATE GOVERNMENTS AND THE PEOPLE ACROSS THIS LAND, AND MAYBE JUST MAYBE, WE CAN COME TO A REALIZATION THAT THE FUTURE IS NOW
PLEASE GOVERNOR INSLEE, AND ALL OTHERS, STAND UP FOR ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF ENERGY AND PLEASE PUT A STOP TO THE COAL TRAINS THAT TRANSPORT DIRTY ENERGY, FROM DIGGING & DESTROYING THE LAND, WILDLIFE & WATERS, TO SPEWING PARTICULATES & COAL DUST ACROSS THE STATE

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Valerie Wales
Organization: Occupy Spokane

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climatetworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
The impact of many more coal trains will disrupt traffic, schools, emergency vehicles, and create more stress on the rail infrastructure.

Thank you.

Valerie
October 16, 2013

Governor Jay Inslee
Office of the Governor
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Re: Request for State Carbon Emissions Plan via a Consent Decree in the Our Children’s Trust Litigation

Mr. Governor:

I am writing on behalf of the Gonzaga University Environmental Law Clinic and the Spokane Riverkeeper.

The Environmental Law Clinic provides legal representation to not-for-profit environmental programs in the Inland Northwest, and strives to protect and restore the quality and integrity of the region’s waters through advocacy and public interest litigation.

As I am sure you are aware, there is a current string of litigation throughout the country titled “Our Children’s Trust Litigation.” The mission of the group is “to protect earth’s atmosphere and natural systems for present and future generations (...) through legal action” (http://ourchildrenstrust.org/Mission).

Just less than a year ago, the campaign in Washington, on behalf of “seven young petitioners and their guardians, filed their final brief in the Washington Supreme Court asking it to reverse a lower court’s dismissal of their case to protect public trust resources of the state” (Legal Updates. November 27th, 2012. http://ourchildrenstrust.org/state/washington).

The “Public Trust Doctrine” dates back to Roman law. It is the idea that some of society’s resources are too precious and important to allow private interests to control them. This doctrine is one of the oldest in American environmental law, with cases dating back to the late 1800s where the courts ruled that shorelines could not be given to private entities. We have completely lost this doctrine’s applicability in the realm of environmental law today, and now Washington State has a chance to restore its principles.

Pursuant to WAC 173-340-520, the state Department of Ecology, can enter into a consent decree with all PLP (possible liable parties) to close the Children's Trust case. Such a decree should address emission levels, and it should provide a plan on how to reduce emissions annually. The decree will be written into law, and the state will have to adhere to the annual reductions. Since agents of the state are defendants themselves, the action would more or less be a policy decision by the state to address climate change, sending a strong important message for other states to follow by example.
The science to plan for a specific emission reduction plan is in place. Dr. James Hansen, a professor at Columbia University and a leading voice on climate change has formulated hard science on atmospheric conditions. Current initiatives and programs are only pieces of the puzzle; state and federal law has failed to address the hard science in an all-encompassing plan. According to Dr. Hansen, we can avoid runaway heating of our atmosphere if we begin to reduce our emissions now—by 6% per year. This figure is still attainable, but the window is small. If we were to wait ten years, for example, the reduction figure jumps to 15%—nearing the realm of impossibility.

This figure is rooted in natural law. By natural law, I do not mean the philosophical concept put forth by many legal scholars, but rather, the true scientific laws of nature. Our regulations and environmental efforts on a policy end should try as closely as possible to adhere to the existent scientific laws and workings of the environment. For example, Congress did not “write” the law of gravity, but we are subjected to it.

With that being said, Washington state has an amazing opportunity to take advantage of the current pending litigation with a plan of action in the form of a consent decree, Washington state can be the first state to address global climate change on this scale at the state level—we can be the first state that is willing to be a solution to the problem that we have all created globally.

I have hope for the state and its leaders.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Andrew D. Woods
Law Clerk

ADW/rke/vly
Climate & Energy

Send to printer


What if Americans could easily invest in all of the above? With Clean Energy Victory Bonds, we can!

For the past three years, Green America has worked to make Clean Energy Victory Bonds a reality in America, and as of August 2, 2012, we’re a step closer, with the Clean Energy Victory Bonds Act of 2012 Introduced in the US House of Representatives.

Clean Energy Victory Bonds - Invest In Our Future

Just like World War II era victory bonds enabled ordinary Americans to raise billions of dollars for the war effort, these new bonds are projected to raise enough money to generate 1.7 million new jobs manufacturing, deploying, and maintaining renewable energy projects. This bill ends the financial uncertainty around current federal programs, extending the imperiled Production Tax Credit for wind energy — and other renewable energy incentives -- for as long as a decade.

Big thanks to Rep. Bob Filner (D, CA), who is sponsoring the bill, along with 10 co-sponsors, and big thanks to more than 40 other organizations* who are backing the bill with us. Now we need to get this bill passed. Here’s where your support is crucial. This is what we need you to do:

1. Call your representative -- Look up your representative’s telephone number here, give their office a call, and tell them that you enthusiastically support H.R. 6275, the Clean Energy Victory Bonds Act of 2012. If you would be willing to to buy some of these savings bonds (as little as $25 is enough), tell them that too. We need to rapidly bolster bi-partisan support for this job-creating, renewable-energy-boosting bill.
2. Pledge to buy the bonds -- If you haven't already signed on at cleanenergyvictorybonds.org as a future purchaser of the bonds after the legislation passes, please do so right now. We need to be able to show clearly that these bonds have the support of the American people in every congressional district in the country. It's a win-win-win. You support clean energy and American jobs, you put some of your money away in a savings bond, and when they mature in 10 years, you'll get back the purchase price plus interest.

3. Tell your friends -- This part is key! We need to rapidly spread awareness of this bill. Everyone who hears about this strategy loves it, because the bonds advance goals that both Republicans and Democrats can get behind. Tell your friends to sign on at cleanenergyvictorybonds.org, and post a link to the site on your Facebook page. Tweet about it, blog about, tell your neighbor over the fence. However you communicate with others, please share the news of this bill.

Help us make it possible by showing your support »


©2009 Green America. All rights reserved.
The Honorable Governor Jay Inslee  
Climate Legislative and Executive Workshop  
Office of the Governor  
PO Box 40002  
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

October 16, 2013 Testimony

I’m Todd Eklof, minister at the Unitarian Universalist Church of Spokane. Thank you Governor Inslee and members of the Executive workgroup for visiting us and for the opportunity to be heard.

One way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, protect jobs, and the health of our community, is making sure there’s not an increase in the number of coal trains passing through Spokane. Last year the EPA and the World Health Organization upgraded diesel exhaust from a “probable” to a “certain” carcinogenic. Because of our air inversion, which traps pollutants in the air we breathe here, and because diesel particulates are barbed and stick to our lungs for life, an increase in heavy coal trains that require multiple diesel spewing engines, is the equivalent of turning everyone in our community into secondhand smokers of tobacco laced with asbestos.

Coal trains are also job killers. Our community has very few railroad jobs compared to tourism related jobs that contribute billions to our local economy. But nobody will want to visit our “near nature, near perfect,” community once they find our air has become toxic.

Another way to reduce these harmful gases and create jobs is by supporting alternative energy programs and businesses, like Sustainable Works, which last year helped our church place 75 solar panels on our roof, and has enabled many in our community to make thousands of dollars worth of energy saving upgrades to our homes, using local labor, local businesses, and helping support an emerging, cutting-edge industry right here in Washington. Green is good for the environment and the economy.

As you know, Washington State isn’t much on waiting on Washington, DC before moving forward on important issues. From universal healthcare, to Death with Dignity, to intelligent marijuana laws, to being the first and only State to approve marriage equality by popular vote, including 55 percent of voters right here in good old conservative Spokane, with a Republican Mayor whose commitment to cleaning our river makes him one of the greenest in our history. Spokane is now ready to help our State become the leader in Climate change action. With your help Governor, we know we can. And we’ve got your back!

Rev. Dr. Todd F. Eklof  
(502) 299-6408 cell  
(509) 325-6383 office  
minister@uuspokane.org
October 16, 2013

Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
Spokane Falls Community College

To the members of the CLEW,

These comments have been prepared and submitted to the workgroup at the direction of the Okanogan Board of County Commissioners.

Like everyone Okanogan County has concerns on the issue of climate change. Contradictions abound regarding the extent and timetable of climate change and the actual influence the activities of mankind has on its course. Some studies lay the blame on mankind alone yet others point out the most draconian efforts to reduce emissions will have no measureable effect. The role America or in this case the State of Washington has in terms of global emissions has been assessed as well and there seems to be general agreement that our “carbon footprint” compared to other countries, Japan and China to name but two, is a fraction of that generated worldwide. We pose the question, will regulating our economy to a standstill have any real effect on the course of climate change or will it simply result in a victory cry from those who use the issue to push other agendas.

As mentioned above the Okanogan Board of County Commissioners is concerned over the tremendous waste of time and resources spent fighting those who would use the issue of climate change to push a political agenda by entwining the subject with other regulation such as the Endangered Species Act. The proposed wolverine listing is directed at the issue of climate change and if adopted would place tremendous power in the hands of the regulatory agencies rather than congress where it belongs. The creation of carbon credit programs will do nothing to reduce emissions in any real way but it will generate cash flow to finance other regulatory programs. This type of program will serve to further price small business out of existence as they will be unable to either pay the credits or comply with the regulation which is the only alternative. These are but two examples of the legitimate concerns we believe must be addressed before any new regulatory scheme is considered.

We emphasize the point that there isn’t universal agreement in terms of to what extent, or if at all, the activities of man impact the rate of climate change. Recent articles have asserted that a draconian reduction in carbon emissions will have little
measurable effect. Before considering any regulation, or leaving in place existing legislation, a critical analysis must be conducted that examines the actual, measureable, achievable results that can be expected from new regulatory programs. These results must be measured against the actual and collateral cost such programs will have on our taxpayers and businesses. Our concern is the benefits will be far outweighed by the costs.

There is no credible body of science that conclusively establishes that a warmer climate is necessarily a drier climate. Mother Nature will determine that. We already suffer from seasonal stresses placed on our water storage and delivery systems. There are programs that could be implemented that would both reduce carbon emissions and mitigate for a potential loss of water storage now provided in the snowpack. These types of infrastructure improvements ought to be under consideration whether they improve the course of climate change or not. Hydro-power is a clean and renewable resource. With the tremendous advances in hydro-power technology energy can now be produced with minimal impact to the environment. Hydro-power by its nature can be coupled with an increased capacity for water storage. By generating bigger quantities of clean energy the reliance on fossil fuels will be reduced and whatever contribution it makes to climate change minimized as well. By creating more water storage, including using off the main-stem impoundments and groundwater aquifers, any impacts brought about by the potential loss of snowpack can be reduced. At the same time high quality wetlands can be preserved or created and in-stream flows maintained while having more water available to be put to beneficial use.

Unfortunately much of the opposition to expanded hydro-power and other programs that would mitigate impacts attributed to climate change are found in the same organizations that are the biggest proponents of the climate change agenda.

We believe the time for rhetoric is long past. Whatever model of climate change is accurate there are things we should be doing merely because they make sense to do. Our national forests are in deplorable condition due to decades of mismanagement. A body of credible science exists that demonstrates that healthy, well managed forests enhance watershed hence water supply. They have a more robust growth rate which in turn removes carbon from the atmosphere. A healthy forest provides other renewable resources which contribute to the overall vibrancy of our economy. Anyone who is truly concerned about climate change must support a much more aggressive approach to forest management. Consistent with our point made above many who beat the climate change drum also espouse a hands-off approach to forest management. One catastrophic wildfire creates negative impacts to the environment that takes decades to correct and creates health risks such as respiratory hazards over a wide area. A catastrophic wildfire undoes the results of the most aggressive emission regulation in a single event. A healthy well-managed forest is at much less
risk of catastrophic wildfire.

There are many more examples that we could offer but it is sufficient for purposes of these comments to summarize our main point. The climate change issue has been used by many to push a political agenda so extreme that it poses a great threat to the very environment it is supposed to protect. Just as we shouldn’t promote the burning of more coal simply because companies want to sell more we also cannot support a hands-off approach to hydro-power and forest management simply because there are those who dream of a time when mankind was absent from the landscape. With the economy of the United States in trouble; with our forests in deplorable condition; with greater demands being placed on our water storage and delivery systems; the luxury of philosophical debate is behind us. We as a nation must take decisive steps to preserve and protect the resources that made us great. We are under a moral obligation to wisely and aggressively manage our natural resources to the betterment of the generations to come. If along the way of accomplishing these steps a positive impact on the timetable and/or extent of climate change is realized than that is better yet.

We urge the committee to not fall prey to the desire to be known as the state with the toughest stance on climate change. The Okanogan Board of County Commissioners would rather we be known as the state that took the most reasonable and effective approach to conducting the administrative business of our citizens. We must support small business which is the backbone of our economy. We must manage our natural resources for the generations to come. It is our duty as the duly elected representatives of the citizens.

Submitted on behalf of the Okanogan Board of County Commissioners,

Perry D. Huston
Perry D. Huston, Director
Okanogan Planning and Community Development
NEW IN-STATE RESEARCH:

Establish research programs at WSU and U of W for developing low energy nuclear reaction (LENR) (cold fusion) clean energy systems. Learn from such a program at the University of Missouri under the direction of Robert Duncan. Coordinate efforts with other research activities in the US and elsewhere to become a leader in this area. (For example, MIT; Purdue U.; U of Ill.; Standard Research Institute (SRI) and others)

Make all research public via on-line quarterly reports of activities. Actively resist being gagged (keeping results secret) by industry and the US government. Make sure funding agreements do not inhibit publication and/or make results proprietary.

Actively promote the LENR research work and condemn advertisement that goes against the initiative to gain economical clean energy sources.

NEW WASHINGTON STATE OWNED ENTERPRISE:

Plan and establish a Washington State Public Utility producing clean energy in competition with private entities. Use the State Ferry System, the publicly owned hydroelectric dams and other public enterprises as examples for this new endeavor.

TAXES, ZONING CHANGES and NEW SPECIFIC TARGETS:

All sectors of transportation--rail, barge, private auto, truck, air and pipeline--should be targeted separately for new actions to reduce their contribution of greenhouse gases to the 1990 levels.

Any vehicle transporting a carbon based fuel (i.e., a train, a truck, a barge, a pipeline) should be taxed at a rate 5 times the existing rate. If taxes do not already exist for transportation of such materials, they should be established. In general the EIS process should be used to identify environmental impacts and to assign related equivalent economic impacts to provide a rational basis for taxation. For example, coal trains in Washington are likely to increase the cost of emergency health care for individuals whose access to emergency care would be impeded. This cost and others should be allowed to be recouped by taxation.

No new facilities for the transportation of carbon based fuels should be given building permits. Zoning laws for such existing facilities should be modified to prohibit new construction to expand existing through-put capacity. In addition new zoning should require a fractional reduction of through-put capacity with time, equivalent to the 2008 targets.

Establish special taxes on business that profit from the use of hydrocarbon fuels and assign the tax to support the research activities described hereinafter.

"Taking costs out of the system means taking money out of somebody's pockets. This is what the business world calls "creative destruction."" New York times 10/14/13 REGARDING OBAMACARE HEALTH SYSTEM CHANGES AND INCREASED COMPETITION

SUBMITTED BY:
F. ROBERT COOK, 730 E 40th Avenue, Spokane, WA 99203, Tele: 509-747-0648;
email, frobertcook@hotmail.com
First of all, Climate Change was originally called “Global Warming”. The claim of a man-made Global Warming was the backbone of all the Growth Management Laws that have since been established in every state in the USA. The problem is that all the data that has surfaced since this claim of a man-made Global Warming” has shown that hasn’t been any increase in temperature for the past 17 years.

There has been one scientific organization after another over the past couple years that has provided data that states there is no “Global Warming”. In fact, the media has caught on to this information as well, which started soon after Al Gore’s speaking events were being cancelled one after another due to the tremendous amounts of snow. It is now a taboo thing for the media/news agencies to even use the term of Global Warming”, and so now the United Nations has declared that it is no longer Global Warming, but simply, “Climate Change”.

The Rajendra Pachauri, who heads the UN’s International Panel on Climate Change(IPCC) recently admitted that fact in Australia. In an article titled “Time to Jail the Climate Scamsters” by Lord Monkton, he states, “The Hadley/CRU temperature record shows no warming for 18-19 years. RSS satellites show none for 23 years. Not one computer model predicted that.”

In an article titled “Climate Change Experts: You Should Be Dead by Now”(www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/19/climate_change_ice-capped_119998.html) John Stokes states that the resulting climate devastation will kill an estimated 4.5 Billion people in five years. The only problem was that was stated in 2007. Stokes goes on to explain: “Runaway Global Warming promises to literally burn-up agricultural areas into dust worldwide by 2012, causing global famine, anarchy, diseases, and end war on a global scale as military powers including the US, Russia and China fight for control of the Earth’s remaining resources.”

Not only that, but NOAA has recently reported that both polar regions have had a significant increase in ice expansion, with the Arctic ice increasing by 60% in one year alone. What about the Global Warming that was supposed to raise the sea levels so much that everyone living on the coastlines would be flooded out and the all this because the polar ice caps would melt, drown all the polar bears, etc, etc...? Nothing, as we can now see, could be further from the truth. This fact has sent all the United Nations agencies and the IPCC into a tailspin as they are the pushers of the whole idea of a man-made Global Warming”. In fact, the NOAA report has also caused the US Congress to require 1,500 changes in the IPCCs documents on Climate Change that was going to be discussed at a Climate Change Conference in November.

According to an article titled “New Australian PM abolishes climate watchdog”, published on France 24 (www.france24.com/en), this recent smattering of data collection has also caused Australia to abolish an independent climate change commission. They (Prime Minister Tony Abbott) have also claimed that the top priority of action now was to “scrap the carbon tax”. Abbott, who once said that evidence blaming mankind for climate change was “absolute crap”, and ordered officials to immediately “prepare the carbon tax repeal legislation”.

As Dr. Don Easterbrook, a professor of geology at Western Washington University points out in an article titled “The True Global Warming Crisis: The Fibs Underlying the Theory” by Larry Bell, “There just isn’t any nice way to say this- it’s an outright lie.” He notes that the vast published literature shows that recent warming is not only NOT unusual, but more intense warming has occurred many times in past centuries and millennia.”
Here is WA, we have taken a huge hit on our property and water rights. Our farmers are heavily under attack because of all these fraudulently based regulations that are now in place. Australia is repealing all their global warming/climate change scam related policies, and we should be next. We can no longer obey any law that is based upon something that has now been proven to be an outright false claim. Anyone with any sort of brain at all has to understand that only a moron would follow a law that was based on false claims, and therefore, it is our Governor’s duty to go about repealing all GMA laws and all associated regulations, just as Gov. Rick Scott of FLA has already done for his state.

We want our property and Water rights restored immediately.

Signed:

Rene’ Holaday

P.O. Box 192 Addy, WA

99101
Memo to Al Gore -- IPCC report confirms the "planetary emergency" is over

By Mario Lewis

Published October 11, 2013 | FoxNews.com

Is global warming a looming catastrophe that will destroy life as we know it unless America and the world rapidly wean themselves off deadly fossil fuels?

That is the deep green message Al Gore and countless other influential individuals and organizations have preached for years, and they continually invoke the "consensus of scientists" as the alleged authority for their assessment and agenda.

But a funny thing happened on the way to the apocalypse. The command post and fortress of the so-called scientific consensus, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), just canceled Al Gore's planetary emergency.

Okay, the IPCC does not do so in as many words. That would be too great an admission against interest for an organization whose prestige, influence, and perks utterly depend on keeping the public alarmed about climate change.

Nonetheless, even while declaring itself more confident than ever that most global warming is man-made (despite the ongoing 16-year warming pause that consensus climatologists did not anticipate and still struggle to explain), the IPCC is also more confident that no warming-induced catastrophes will occur during the 21st Century. Talk about an inconvenient truth!

The scariest parts of the planetary emergency narrative popularized by Gore and other climate doomsters are an Atlantic Ocean circulation shutdown that plunges Europe into a mini-ice age; disintegration of the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets that would raise sea levels as much as 20 feet in our lifetimes or those of our children and grandchildren; and runaway warming from melting frozen methane deposits that in the worst case could cause mass species extinctions.

IPCC now declares that in the 21st Century, Atlantic Ocean circulation collapse is "very unlikely," ice sheet collapse is "exceptionally unlikely," and catastrophic release of methane from melting permafrost is "very unlikely."

You can read it for yourself in Table 12.4 of chapter 12 of the IPCC's forthcoming Fifth Assessment Report.

But these doomsday scenarios have always been way more fiction than science. For some time now, an alleged warming link to extreme weather has been the only card left in the climate alarm deck. Climate activists repeatedly assert that severe droughts, floods, and Hurricane Sandy are now the "new normal," and, of course, they blame fossil fuels and "climate change."

Actual weather data do not support that storyline either. There has been no long-term change in the strength or frequency of hurricanes, tornados, U.S. floods, or drought. Similarly, there has been no long-term change in "normalized" extreme weather damages (weather-related losses adjusted for increases in population, wealth, and inflation).

The IPCC has come around to that overall assessment too. Among the findings in chapter 2 of the IPCC report:

- "Current datasets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century ... No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricanes counts have been identified over the past 100 years in the North Atlantic basin."

- "In summary, there continues to be a lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency of floods on a global scale."

- "Based on updated studies, AR4 [the 2007 IPCC report] conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated."
"In summary, confidence in large scale changes in the intensity of extreme extra-tropical cyclones since 1900 is low."

University of Colorado Prof. Roger Pielke, Jr., a key participant in the debate on climate change and extreme weather, explains the IPCC’s non-alarming findings as follows: "the data says what it says, and what it says is so unavoidably obvious that the IPCC has recognized it in its consensus."

Pielke, Jr.’s summary comment is worth quoting in full: "Of course, I have no doubts that claims will still be made associating floods, drought, hurricanes and tornadoes with human-caused climate change — Zombie science — but I am declaring victory in this debate. Climate campaigners would do their movement a favor by getting themselves on the right side of the evidence."

And Al Gore should find a new schtick.
Climate Change Reconsidered
October 23, 2013
Ken Garceau

Approximately 15,000 years ago this region was covered by an ice sheet 700 meters thick (2200+ ft.) which held back the famed Lake Missoula. Over a 2000 year period geologists estimate the ice dam ruptured and reformed 55 times between 15,000 and 13,000 years ago. These floods were estimated to have traveled at between 65 to 80 MPH. 10 times the combined flow of ALL the world's rivers.

The Woolly Mammoth disappeared from North America about 10,000 years ago.

The Little Ice Age ended around 1850; from that time to 1940 the temperature increased 1 degree.

The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) will have you believe that the CO2 levels are strictly man made. They do not take into consideration:

1. Volcanism
2. Shifting ocean currents and jet streams
3. Cosmic ray fluxes
4. Winds, Clouds, Perception
5. El Niño and La Nina
6. Position of the earth to the sun. (The earth travels in an elliptical orbit around the sun.)
7. Never mind the Arctic Ice Cap which was predicted in 2007, to be gone by 2013 has grown by One Million square miles.

The Motivating factors for the Global Warming Hoax:

2. Scientists want and are getting millions in Global Warming Research Grants.
5. Governments want to control energy in order to regulate and wield tremendous power over industries and the citizens.

Over riding question:

Why are President Obama, Governor Inslee and the EPA doing this? They say: It’s to stop global warming. What Global Warming? The scientists at the center of the Climate Gate scandal admitted back in 2010 there has been NO statistically significant global warming since 1995. In fact, since 2002 global temperatures have gone down slightly.

Do you see a pattern here? Make wild clams about global warming and looming catastrophes. Manipulate the data, ignore the facts, and shut up anyone who tries to speak the truth. Then regulate the economy on the basis of phony science and scare stories. It’s all straight out of Al Gore’s playbook.
In short it is all about money, control, corruption and power! It is all about big government control over our lives and the economy.

REMEMBER: ABSOLUTE POWER CORRUPTS ABSOLUTELY

ENC: Hand out: Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change Reconsidered II, Summary for Policymakers. Link to complete study, Ken Garceau’s presentation
Executive Summary

Sustainable Washington 2009:
Planning for Climate Change

November 2009
Eight Principles for Meeting the Climate Change Challenge

As we engage in this call to action, we remind planners of the principles underlying this effort:

1) **Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions** – both from vehicles through land use planning approaches and buildings through incentives and development regulations.

2) **Integrate Issues** – develop policies and programs that include issues beyond land use – food systems, hazards, local economy, and social equity.

3) **Think Holistically** – connect across government departments, special districts, agencies, and professions to identify and integrate holistic solutions.

4) **Engage & Educate** – protect the public interest and involve citizens in climate change decision-making and actions.

5) **Plan & Act Strategically** – use the full array of planning tools strategically to incorporate climate change issues.

6) **Create Benchmarks** – set benchmarks over the necessary long time frames to monitor progress.

7) **Be Adaptive** – assure adaptation to climate change is well-planned and equitable, as well as flexible and adaptive as our understanding of climate change impacts evolves.

8) **Be Leaders** – planners are trained to be inclusive, holistic and integrative – the characteristics needed of leaders as we face this challenge.

Reasons to be Proactive:

1) We need to act now because climate change is already in motion.

2) Significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is possible, but it is unlikely that greenhouse gas emissions will be stabilized or reversed in the near term.

3) Climate change is expected to continue long after greenhouse gases are stabilized.

4) Climate change will likely lead to irreversible losses in some areas.

5) Climate change will have largely negative economic consequences, but may also create economic opportunities.

6) Preparing for climate change is “good government.”

7) Localities, regions and states are on the front lines of climate change impacts, and have a responsibility to respond.

8) Proactive planning is more effective and less costly than responding reactively to climate change impacts as they happen.

9) Thinking strategically can reduce future risks and increase future benefits.

10) Anticipating future changes can add value to today’s investments at low additional cost.

---

Commitments from the APA

The APA Washington Board of Directors is committed to following up on the recommendations of Sustainable Washington through its legislative agenda. APA Washington’s active and extensive Legislative Committee has defined a number of actions needed at the state level to address climate change and will support legislation to enact these changes.

APA Washington is committed to an outreach effort to connect with regional and state planning entities, allied professions, and relevant non-profit organizations to share the information included in Sustainable Washington.

Additionally, we know that both the science of climate change and the range and effectiveness of responses will advance. APA Washington commits to future editions of Sustainable Washington and/or changes to the resource base on the APA Washington website to capture those advancements and to stay current and effective as a useful tool.

---

A Call to Action

Climate change is no longer a speculation by scientists looking to predict the future with limited evidence. To our great concern, the largest uncertainty remains not about if it will occur, but only how quickly it will come and how much our actions can slow or reduce its impact.

Climate change is a unique and unprecedented challenge. It is one that planners cannot solve alone, but neither can it be solved by any single profession, invention, or innovation. It will take the combined efforts and the combined expertise of many planners, architects, engineers, inventors, investors, politicians, scientists and citizens to make a real and lasting difference. Planners, by virtue of their holistic, long-term, and integrative approach, can take a leadership role in developing and implementing lasting solutions.

We need our planners, not just to plan, but to lead. There is no time left to wait for others in this effort.

The time to act is now.
A Unique Challenge

How do planners relate to these global challenges? Action intended to reduce the amount of greenhouse (GHG) gases produced by industrial society can be described by the collective label of mitigation. Many measures that planners can influence—energy conservation, compact urban development, green construction practices—are forms of mitigation. Planners also have an essential role in adaptation—planning for the consequences of climate change—through measures that protect life and property from climate produced impacts such as flooding and forest fires and climate-induced environmental changes such as sea level rise and reduced water supplies.

What Can Planners Do?

The full Sustainable Washington: Planning for Climate Change document is posted on the APA Washington website at: www.washington-apa.org/sustainable_washington. This web-based document lists nearly 200 actions that planners can take to provide both mitigation and adaptation to climate change. The sampling below provides a few highlights from each of the eleven topic areas addressed in the extensive web-based document.

Impacts and Hazards

- Acknowledge and include longer term planning.

Expand your planning horizons beyond short (one to five-year) and medium (five to 20-year) time frames to include longer (50-plus year) plan horizons. The cumulative impacts and hazards associated with climate change extend well beyond the traditional planning time frames used in state, regional, and local planning, even under GMA.

Water and Ecosystems

- Realign shorelines and critical areas protections.

Clarify in state regulations and local codes that the science behind both shoreline master programs and critical areas regulations should apply comprehensively and consistently to these important ecosystems.

- Reuse water.

Encourage and remove barriers to the use of rainwater, gray water and wastewater on-site for non-potable water needs. Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation in new developments and on public property.

Energy Use in the Built Environment

- Conduct an audit of municipal buildings.

Recently passed energy efficiency legislation (SB 5854) mandates strengthening energy codes in Washington State during the next four through 22 years and requires an Energy Star Building Operations audit of municipal buildings by 2010.

Land Use

- Amend regulations to support smart growth.

Amend local regulations—including zoning and subdivision ordinances, parking standards, annexation rules, adequate public facilities requirements, and design guidelines—to facilitate smart growth through normal approval processes.

- Promote adaptation and infill over greenfield development.

Create incentive programs that foster infill in existing districts over new development on greenfield sites; and establish impact fees that encompass the true costs of extending infrastructure to greenfield sites.

APA Washington’s six principles to guide a Smart Growth strategy:

1. Build on strong public support for environmental protection
2. Create statutory clarity
3. Promote efficient governance
4. Focus state investments
5. Promote housing affordability
6. Provide resources for planning
Washington’s GMA and Climate Change

Washington’s Growth Management Act (GMA) is among the nation’s most forward-thinking planning-enabling legislation. GMA’s broad reach and spectrum of issues addressed make it central to planners’ response to climate change.

In January 2009, APA Washington released a report entitled “Toward a Smart Growth Strategy for Washington.” This report offered general guidelines and specific recommendations for statutory changes to the GMA to help address climate change and other important issues. Below are selected recommendations relevant to climate change:

- Add climate change to the goals of GMA. The Chapter continues to support amending GMA planning goals to include climate change, either as a stand-alone goal or as part of the existing environment goal.

- Create a statewide GMA plan. In the Livable Washington 2050 update, the Chapter called on the State to develop a statewide plan addressing the environment, rural lands, governance, infrastructure funding, economic development, and more. The Chapter continues to believe that a comprehensive statewide plan is needed.

- Target State infrastructure funds (and local infrastructure assistance funds) on projects that reduce climate change emissions. HB 5560 is a step in this direction. The Chapter encourages the strong implementation of this legislation.

- Amend GMA to recognize the role of transit-oriented development and multi-modal transportation in concurrency. Encourage compact urban development and multi-modal transportation via flexible concurrency requirements as an approach under GMA by amending the language in 36.70A.070(6).

- Require that reductions in vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions be addressed regionally. The Chapter continues to believe that this is a regional issue that should be addressed in regional transportation plans. This would be accomplished by amending RCW 47.80.

- Require Special Purpose Districts to create plans consistent with local and regional GMA plans. It has been the long-standing position of the Chapter that these special districts should be brought under the planning requirements of the Act. The Chapter continues to believe this should be accomplished by amending RCW 36.70A.040 and 280.

- Provide financial resources and retain Department of Commerce technical assistance for local climate change planning. The state budget allocation for the Department of Commerce’s technical assistance program should support a stronger climate-change program.

Beyond GMA: Sustainability

While the Growth Management Act provides a central framework for planning in Washington State, planning for climate change requires expanding the focus of GMA to embrace planning for sustainability. Ultimately, we need to plan for more people in ways that use even fewer of our resources than we do now. Without a comprehensive reworking of the various planning, economic and environmental tools available in Washington State into a cohesive—and efficient—whole, it is likely that what we will see is a steady expansion of mandates, increase in complexity, and confusion of purpose. Rather than a layering of regulation, what we need is a simpler, more cohesive, and more sustainable approach.
Looking Back

My term as APA Washington President ended on June 30, 2011. The past two years presented significant challenges to our Chapter, profession, nation and world that many of us have never experienced before. To say in the Fall of 2011 that our Chapter finances are stable is quite an accomplishment after two years of serious budget issues.

Despite our "great recession" over the past two years we as a Chapter have:

- Educated our State Legislators about issues of concern to our profession
- Provided pro bono planning services to small communities across the state
- Improved our membership communications, using e-mail, LinkedIn and Facebook
- Approved our first dues restructuring in 12 years (part of why we now have a stable budget)
- Continued seeking operating efficiencies, such as using low-cost electronic voting rather than expensive regular mail
- Revitalized the planning awards program
- Held our first planning conferences in Vancouver and in the Tri Cities

Thank you all for your support and help over the last two years. The names mentioned throughout this report are the people you and I have to thank for our Chapter's successes.

Finally, producing our first annual report has been a goal of mine for several years. Thanks to each Committee chair as well as Jill Sterrett, FAICP, Ivan Miller, AICP and Andrew Estep for their work in helping write and produce this report. With difficult economic times, planners are increasingly questioning the value of their APA membership. This report will help inform its readers of the value of membership and highlights and celebrates our achievements. I hope you enjoy reading the report and decide to volunteer for a committee or otherwise become more involved with APA Washington.

Scott Greenberg, AICP
Past President
APA National
Message from AICP Immediate Past-president Paul Inghram, AICP

Serving as AICP President was an incredible opportunity to meet planners and to learn about what’s happening in planning. I’ve truly enjoyed establishing friendships and connections throughout the planning community while guiding the APA/AICP organization. However, it has also been a challenging time. The Great Recession led to numerous job losses in the planning profession, nearly non-existent development, and slim prospects for students entering the job market. With my term on the AICP Commission ending next spring, I want to acknowledge the important work that continues with APA and AICP.

The Sustaining Places Initiative – APA established this initiative to reassert planning leadership in advancing community sustainability. This multi-faceted program is working to define the role of planning in addressing human settlement issues relating to sustainability. A Sustaining Places Task Force is focusing on the role of the comprehensive plan as the leading policy document and tool to help communities of all sizes achieve sustainability. This national efforts ties in nicely with the Washington Chapter’s Sustainable Washington initiative that provides a resource for planners working toward creating sustainable communities while attempting to develop adaptation and mitigation strategies to address the impacts of climate change.

Advocating for Planning – APA’s Development Plan calls upon us to advocate for more effective government practices and to generate the big ideas to sustain our communities. The federal administration’s focus on urban issues and sustainability offers planners new opportunities to advance the role of planning. APA’s policy staff actively engages in advising federal officials on a wide range of planning issues. An important annual event is APA’s annual federal policy conference and Planners’ Day on the Hill initiative where planners from across the country take the planning message to Capital Hill.

Selling planning in tough times – In 2003, APA committed to developing a communications strategy to enhance our ability to “tell the planning story.” Implemented tactics include a Planners’ Communications Guide, National Community Planning Month, the Great Places in America program, and a consistent brand image for APA and its components. APA will continue to work with chapters and members to communicate that now is the time to invest in our communities’ futures.

Advanced Specialty Certification – AICP announced the first Advanced Specialty Certifications for AICP planners in 2010. These new certifications for AICP Certified Transportation Planner and AICP Certified Environmental Planner allow AICP members with eight years of specialized experience to seek recognition of their special expertise and leadership, helping them remain professionally competitive. AICP is looking forward to developing additional certifications for a limited number of areas of specialization.

Community Assistance – I’m most proud to see AICP make a stronger commitment to our obligation as planners to serve the public interest. I formed a Community Planning Assistance Task Force and charged it with identifying how to expand national- and chapter-level pro-bono planning efforts to aid distressed communities. I’d like to thank Paula Reeves and Kristian Kofoed for their help on this effort. As a result, the re-vamped Community Assistance Program launched during 2010. The first community to receive help from the new program, Mathews, North Carolina, hosted a planning assistance team in July to assist the town with addressing new economic opportunities while maintaining the area’s unique character and affordability. More events are being planned. If you’re interested in participating on a future team, applications for team members and communities are now on the web.
Membership

From 2005-2010, Chapter membership remained relatively constant averaging 1,567 members. However, the impacts of the recession were felt beginning in 2011 when membership dropped to 1,357 members. A full 25% of these members are AICP and three FAICPs were added in 2010.

To help serve members around the state, the chapter has six geographic sections that provide local programs and services (see the Section reports on the following pages). In 2011, the chapter will be focusing additional efforts on membership services, recruitment and retention.
Budget

As with many non-profit organizations, the economic downturn had a negative effect on the finances of APA Washington Chapter. All three of the primary components of the Chapter's income—advertisements, chapter dues, and conference income—fell dramatically in 2009 and 2010. Despite our conservative income projections and reductions in services in 2009 and 2010, in 2010, our expenditures exceeded revenues by $44,637.39 and we had to draw on our reserves to meet expenses.

Faced with a projected deficit in 2011, the chapter formed an ad-hoc budget committee in the fall of 2010 to advise the Board on its 2011 budget. The budget committee consisted of President Scott Greenberg, President-Elect Jill Sterrett, Vice-President Ferdouse Oneza, Treasurer Brad Medrud, Board members Esther Larsen, Ivan Miller, Bill Mandeville, and Richard Hart, along with Chapter member Kevin Snyder, and a Past President, Lisa Verner. The committee met several times and spent a great deal of time reaching some tough decisions on the Chapter's priorities and creating a positive balance for the 2011 Chapter budget. Because of the great work by members of the budget committee, we were able to produce a budget that worked in 2011 and then build on that work in adopting the 2012 budget. In 2011, expected revenues exceeded expenditures by $26,559.41.

Expenses and Income for 2010 and 2011

Please note that the total income and expenses for the 2011 Conference is not reflected in the 2011 graphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Expenses Summary</th>
<th>2010 Revenue Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.4% Conferences</td>
<td>68.4% State Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4% Committees/Programs</td>
<td>25.4% Chapter Dues Rebate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3% Administration</td>
<td>4.0% Advertisements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0% Scholarship</td>
<td>1.4% Student Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9% Sections</td>
<td>0.8% AICP Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% Interest Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$199,271.46

$154,634.07

just the amounts that passed directly through the APA Chapter accounts.
Legislative Action

The Legislative Committee prepares a legislative agenda, reviews legislative bills, gives testimony on legislative matters of concern to the Chapter, works to get APA bills sponsored, is involved in legislative-related activities, and informs the Board and chapter membership about pertinent legislative issues.

Co-Chairs: Josh Peters and Esther Larsen

The Chapter has a strong and active Legislative Committee. The committee meets weekly via conference call during the State legislative session to review and discuss proposed legislation, receive updates from our Chapter lobbyist and provide direction for commenting on legislation.

The Chapter also proposes legislation through the Bill Proposal Subcommittee. Bills we have sponsored that have become law in recent years include:

- prohibiting expansions of UGAs into 100 year floodplains,
- creating flexibility for local governments to do subarea planning.

Chapter members can propose legislation for the Chapter Board to consider sponsoring. Over the past few years, various stakeholders have sought APA Washington's opinions and support related to planning-related proposals.

2011 Legislative Session Summary

The 2011 legislative session was dominated by the State’s operating budget crisis. The Legislature needed a 30-day special session in addition to the 105 day regular session to pass their biennial budget and items not essential to its passage received little attention. Thus, few significant land use or planning bills reached the Governor's desk.

Planning-Related Bills that passed into law:

**HB 1012:** Allows a city, town or county to establish a four-year or a six-year term of office for appointive members of an established planning commission.

**ESHB 1071:** Creates a Complete Streets Grant Program.

**EHB 1171:** Addresses high capacity transportation system planning.

**ESHB 1478:** This bill delayed or modified certain regulatory and statutory requirements affecting cities and counties. The bill revised the comprehensive plan and shoreline master program review and revision schedule – changing from seven to eight years when the review must take place. The bill granted an additional two years for meeting the review and the requirements for smaller and slow growing counties and cities. Also, the bill delayed the requirement for state agencies and local government subdivisions to change their fleets to electrical or bio-fuel, and extended the period from six to 10 years when a county or city must expend or encumber impact fees.

**ESHB 1886:** Implements the recommendations of the Ruckelshaus Center process regarding conflicts between agricultural uses and critical areas protection. As an alternative to protecting critical areas used for agricultural purposes, a county may elect to protect the critical areas through a new Voluntary Stewardship Program.

**SSB 5192:** Concerns provisions for notification and appeals timelines under the Shoreline Management Act.

**ESSB 5253:** Concerns tax increment financing for landscape conservation and local infrastructure. This bill defines an eligible county as one that borders Puget Sound, has 600,000 or more residents, and that has an established TDR program.

**SSB 5451:** Allows DOE to approve new or amended shoreline master programs to include provisions authorizing qualifying residential structures and appurtenant structures to be considered conforming structures; and redevelopment, expansion, change with the class of occupancy, or replacement of the residential structure if it is consistent with the master program.
Professional Development Committee

The role of the Professional Development Committee is to: (a) to advise prospective AICP members as to the qualifications, purposes, and programs of the Institute, the Code of Professional Responsibility of the Planner, and the Rules of Reference to Institute membership; and (b) to inform AICP members about opportunities and/or requirements for professional development.

In addition to specific training opportunities, the Chapter supports our members through a variety of professional development activities, including:

- Preparation for the AICP exam,
- General Training for all members as well as continuing education for AICP members that qualify for certification maintenance credits, and
- Nomination of planners who have made a significant contribution to the profession to the College of Fellows.

AICP Exams

In the July 2010 through June 2011 period, Washington Chapter provided two sessions to prepare our interested members for the AICP Exam. The Chapter also provides reduced rate scholarships for three exam applicants each year.

Thank you to the instructors who donated their time to lead sessions on a variety of exam likely topics. Instructors participating in the May 2011 exam prep included:

- Shawna Kitzman, AICP (Test-taking Hints)
- Tim Parham, AICP (Test-taking Hints, & Quantitative Methods and GIS)
- Rick Sepler, AICP (Site Development Basics)
- Kevin O’Neill, AICP (History/Theory)
- Nancy Eklund, AICP (Planning Ethics)
- Kris Liljeblad, AICP (Transportation)
- Tim Trohimovich, AICP (Planning Law)
- John Doan, AICP (Budgeting, Finance, and Planning Administration)
excellent communication skills, she has assisted citizens and decision makers in dozens of communities adopt important plans, projects, and programs. She has demonstrated her belief in democratic public policy making, the importance of the consent of the governed, and the power of the planning process. She is a highly effective and respected planning practitioner.

Rocky E. Piro, FAICP
Seattle, Washington
Rocky Piro is a leader and innovator in collaborative regional-local planning in the Seattle area. He oversees the Puget Sound Regional Council’s unique and highly successful Plan Review program. He was responsible for developing some of the nation’s most groundbreaking regional planning policies, which fully integrate environmental sustainability, growth management, health, and clean transportation. As the City of Shoreline Planning Commission chair, Rocky provided direction for transforming future development to be more compact and urban in character. As the Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Division’s first vice president, he has been a leader in broadening the division’s outreach and programs.

Congratulations to the following 34 planners who recently passed the exam:

**May, 2010 Exam**
- Kadie Bell, AICP
- Katherine Chalmers, AICP
- Charles Davis, AICP
- Steve DeGrush, AICP
- Erin George, AICP
- Steven Letson, AICP
- Robert Matthews, AICP
- Steven Schlenker, AICP
- Amanda Sparr, AICP
- Charles Wisdom, AICP

**November, 2010 Exam**
- Tirrell Black, AICP
- Katherine Cote, AICP
- Julia Egenolf, AICP
- Michael Forsyth, AICP
- Bruce Johnson, AICP
- Shawna Kitzman, AICP
- David Levitan, AICP
- Juniper Nammi, AICP
- Tim Parham, AICP
- Lynn Scroggins, AICP
- Ellen Talbo, AICP
- Sarah Telschow, AICP
- Christina Wollman, AICP

**May, 2011 Exam**
- Ryan Avery, AICP
- Jeannie Beckett, AICP
- Jeffrey Bender, AICP
- Mark Daniel, AICP
- Kevin Gifford, AICP
- Katherine Howe, AICP
- Katherine Idziorek, AICP
- Sean Keithly, AICP
- Barbara Kincaid, AICP
- Alyse Nelson, AICP
- Theresa Turpin, AICP

For the November 2011 exam, we have 26 candidates have applied to take exam.
Annual State Conference

The annual 2010 APA Washington conference was held October 5-6 at Kennewick's Three Rivers Convention Center. The theme was "Resurgent Washington: Implementing Smart and Healthy Growth."

Our 250 attendees enjoyed keynote speakers Tim Arntzen, Executive Director, Port of Kennewick who discussed redevelopment efforts at Clover Island and Wes Wood, CEO, Wisdom N' Treachery, who discussed use of social media in Planning. Attendees were able to choose from 24 breakout sessions and 4 mobile workshops, providing more than 39 CM credits including legal and ethics credits.

In 2011, APA Washington joined with APA Oregon for our fourth joint conference. "Cascadia Collaborative — Bridging to the Future" covered three days (October 19–21) at the Oregon Convention Center in Portland, Oregon. Over 550 attendees were able to choose from 7 mobile workshops, 36 breakout sessions and over 80 CM credits. Keynote speakers were Robin Morris Collin, JD, Willamette University and APA President Mitch Silver.

Details for our 2012 annual conference will be announced soon. We are also looking forward to hosting the APA National Conference in 2015.
The 2011 Planning Award winners are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>WINNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td><strong>Award Winner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Oak Harbor Pioneer Way Street Improvement: Greenroads Project</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(City of Oak Harbor &amp; Perteet Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td><strong>Award Winner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Puyallup South Hill Neighborhood Health Impact Assessment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(City of Puyallup and Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plans</td>
<td><strong>Award Winner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Port Angeles Waterfront Transportation Improvement Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(City of Port Angeles &amp; Studio Cascade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sequim Downtown Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(City of Sequim and LMN Architects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Planning</td>
<td><strong>Award Winner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bicycle Planning, Best Practices and Count Methodology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: Noa Ginger, Andy Hong, John Murphy, Danielle Rose, Peter Schmiedeskamp, Amanda Snypp, Eiji Torikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty: Alon Bassok, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(University of Washington, Department of Urban Design &amp; Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honorable Mention:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Seattle Prism Light Reconnaissance Study</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: David Gregoire, Emily Platt, Anika Jesi, Audrey Mazza, Jack McKool, Keiko Okada, David Nielsen, Sara Cubillos, Anthony Yak, Anne Heron, Kevin Quezon, Aram Dagavarian, Napal Tesfai, Paelina deStephano, Rosey Selig-Addiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty: Marie R. Wong Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Seattle University, College of Arts &amp; Sciences, Urban Studies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Planning Assistance Team

The Community Planning Assistance Team (CPAT) provides expert professional pro bono planning assistance to small Washington towns with limited planning resources.

Co-Chairs: Paula Reeves and Kristian Kofod

Community Planning Assistance Teams (CPAT), a program of the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association since 2005, are groups of volunteer planners. In partnership with the state Department of Commerce, CPAT provides communities (cities, towns or neighborhoods) professional assistance in articulating visions, solving problems or resolving issues.

CPAT’s overall objectives are to connect plans and actions, identify local and regional resources for sustainable planning, and advance the principles of APA for a Livable Washington. We focus on communities that lack planning resources. We also provide an on-line resource funded from the American Planning Association Urban Design and Preservation Division and the Washington State Planning Directors Association. This Community Design and Planning Handbook is available at: http://washington-apa.org/programs/cpat/

Typically, CPAT teams include volunteer planners from all over the state with expertise in land use, transportation, economic development, urban design, natural resources, parks and recreation, historic preservation, and other areas. In addition, CPAT is affiliated with the planning schools at Eastern Washington University and the University of Washington.

For the 2010-11 period, CPAT conducted two workshops for the City of Prosser and Prosser Economic Development Association. During the first workshop held in October 2010, the CPAT team focused on the gateway area or intersection of I-82 and Wine Country Road, focusing on economic development, traffic circulation, and connections to downtown. In May 2011, the second workshop team focused primarily on the downtown revitalization effort. Both of these CPAT teams included students from the University of Washington’s Urban Planning Program and multiple volunteers from different fields related to planning. Under the leadership of Paula Reeves and Kristian Kofod, the planners involved in these workshops included

- **Katherine Ashbeck**, Student Intern, University of Washington
- **Bob Bengford**, Urban Design and Architecture Expert, MAKERS architecture and urban design

- **Greg Griffith**, Historic Preservation, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
- **Terry Lawhead**, Economic Development Expert, Washington State Department of Commerce
- **Janetta Mitchell McCoy**, Community Design & Development, Washington State University
- **Jill Sterrett, FAICP**, Urban Planning and Design, University of Washington
- **Brian Walsh**, Transportation Engineering and Traffic Circulation Expert, Washington State Department of Transportation
- **Sissi Zeng**, Community Planning

Recently, the western Washington community of Port Ludlow has contacted the CPAT program and requested assistance. Washington APA is working with them to plan a workshop for fall 2011.

Additionally, CPAT co-chairs have been working with the national AICP Commission’s Task Force on Community Planning to share Washington APA’s experience so that it may serve as a national model as well as a model for other state chapters seeking to start community planning programs. In June 2011, we participated in the Mississippi Chapter APA meeting on Energy and Sustainability along with other members of the AICP Task Force on Community Planning. We discussed Washington's CPAT program, how it works, and some lessons learned. As a result of the discussion, the Mississippi Chapter is initiating a similar program.
Membership Committee

The Membership Committee facilitates new member needs, recruits new members and assists with the dissemination of Chapter literature and information.

Chair: Anna Nelson

In 2010, the Membership Committee communicated (via the website, mail and email) with new, active and lapsed members. A noticeable trend for 2010 was an overall membership decline.

A future committee goal is to focus recruitment initiatives on the various membership groups (e.g., Planning Board members) and appoint a Membership Committee liaison for such groups (i.e., similar to Student and Tribal representation on the Board).

Senior Action Committee

The Senior Action Committee facilitates the participation of planners that are retired from full-time service in the planning profession in the Chapter. The Committee focuses on investigation of policy issues in Washington State with planning content and implications and reports those investigations to the Board.

Chair: Ken Dueker

The Senior Action Committee (SAC) functions as a place for retired and nearly retired planners and academics to meet and socialize with their peers, be informed about current planning ideas and efforts and engage in initiatives and lobbying to improve the planning environment in the region. It operates as a loosely formed Seattle-based group that meets regularly to keep in touch and to learn. We think that keeping a collection of APA members who are able to volunteer on short notice and whose years of experience provide wisdom and purposeful observation is a benefit to the Chapter. The committee has also been working on a "History of Planning in Washington."

Tribal Planning Committee

The Tribal Planning Committee addresses statewide tribal planning issues.

Chair: Michael Cardwell

The Tribal Planning Committee has provided a link between APA Washington and an active group of tribal planners — the Tribal Transportation Planning Organization (TTPO). It has also informed the Board and chapter membership about tribal planning issues.
commissioners, elected officials, other professionals, and our citizens! Therefore, the NW Section proudly co-sponsored three local planning events which were part of Envision Skagit 2060, a local work sponsored by Skagit County, City of Burlington, and the Environmental Protection Agency to look 50-year growth alternatives for the Skagit Valley:

1) Dr. Robert Lang's presentation on October 27, 2010 on the growth coming to the Cascadia corridor;

2) Bill Kreager's presentation on Thursday, February 15, 2011 titled "Honey I Shrunk the Lots;" and

3) Ed McMahon's presentation on April 28, 2011 titled "The Dollars and Sense of Sustainable Development."

These events were held at the historic Lincoln Theater in downtown Mount Vernon, where more than 300 people gathered each evening to hear these speakers present their views on land use and our future. These presentations are on-line and available for viewing at www.SkagitCounty.net and going to the Envision Skagit page.

Our second objective is to provide a platform where meaningful networking occurs regularly and where professional relationships can grow. A supportive network of planning professionals can offer hard to find resources, sound advice, lessons learned, and be of great encouragement. Knowing who may have the answer you need, at times, can be critical. Each of our quarterly planners forums start with group introductions and describe our current issues and projects. Later we have a morning, noon and afternoon break and provide simple meals to allow those who attend time to network without leaving for lunch.

We have found through section feedback that the ongoing commitment to training and fostering networking and relationship building is well supported by our local section. Since implementing these goals, we have found our quarterly forum attendance double. We plan to continue in this vein and look forward to being a valued part of the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association.

Peninsula Section

In the last year, the Peninsula Section held four public forums. In addition to a variety of topics from Stormwater and Climate Change to Noxious Weeds and Urban Forestry Planting, the local jurisdictions hosting each event brought insights of their latest challenges and achievements. The fall 2010 meeting in Port Orchard included a timely presentation by City Development Director James Weaver on "Just-in-time Planning Management & Preserving Department Budgets", innovative strategies for a Planning Department to adapt to substantial reductions in resources with increasing needs for level of service. Participants in the winter 2011 meeting in the new Poulsbo City Hall building were greeted by Poulsbo mayor Becky Erickson, who described the construction planning and process during challenging funding times. The spring 2011 meeting in Port Angeles included a presentation by City Community and Economic Development Director Nathan West on the recent Waterfront Improvement Transportation Plan around the downtown area, including a day and night animation of the finished product. The summer 2011 Port Townsend forum was in the newly renovated Cotton Building, a former downtown waterfront police station now public meeting space. Development Services Director Rick Sepfer gave a tour of the Civic District, including upgrades to Pope Marine Park and the Salish Circle sculpture by Gerald Tsutakawa (Safeco Field "The Mitt") purchased as part of the City's 1% for Art in Public Places. Rick pointed out upcoming downtown work including replacing historic sidewalks over underground areas, and filling in the troubled "Tidal Clock" to become a plaza for outdoor entertainment.

*Summer 2011 forum participants ponder the Port Townsend waterfront art failure known as the "Tidy Bowl" and tidal debris. It will soon be transformed into a plaza.*
Student Activities and Student Scholarship Committee

The Scholarship Committee consists of representatives from the University of Washington and Eastern Washington University faculties and the membership at large. The Committee advertises the Chapter’s Student Scholarship program at each university, reviews candidates, selects scholarship recipients, and regularly reports on the scholarship program to the Board.

Co-Chairs: Tirrell Black and Gabe Snedeker

Students in Urban Planning at the accredited programs in Washington – Eastern Washington University and the University of Washington – have Planning Student Associations. Members of the Board visit the universities to talk about APA and encourage students to join. Student representatives from these organizations are members of the APA Washington Chapter Board.

Each year, the APA Washington Chapter provides scholarships to in Urban Planning at the accredited programs in Washington. The scholarships are awarded based on a combination of financial need and academic achievement. In 2010, scholarships of $3,000 each were awarded to Steven Hopkins and Adam Webber.

- Stephen Hopkins recently completed his first year in the Master of Urban and Regional Planning Program at EWU. Previously Stephen taught math in elementary school in the Bellevue Schools District, and was inspired to enter planning by his travels in Europe. He currently holds an internship at the Spokane Transit Authority.

- Adam Webber recently completed his first year in the Urban Design and Planning Program at the UW, with an emphasis in urban design. Adam was recently employed in Stockholm, Sweden, where his work included designing city streets, street car alignments, and bike path networks. In addition to his academic work, Adam is a student-faculty liaison and is active in student government.

The scholarships are funded through member dues and a variety of fund raising activities – mostly auctions that occur at the annual state conference. Due to the valiant efforts of Gabe Snedeker and Michael Cardwell, the 2010 auction provided over $2,200.00 to support the scholarships. Some of the major donations were:

- a week in a house in Puerto Vallarta donated by Roger Wagoner,
- a weekend in a house in Seabrook donated by Jeff Boers, and
- Chambers Bay golfing 4 some with framed photo and commemorative items from the US Amateurs donated by Chambers Bay and Joe Scorcio.

- Key volunteers staffing the auction were Gabe Snedeker, Michael Cardwell, Anna Vamvakas and Scott Greenberg.
IPCC authors confident their global warming predictions were wrong

BY RON ARNOLD | SEPTEMBER 20, 2013 AT 8:22 AM

My copy of the leaked final draft of the world’s most influential global warming report, despite authors of the highest reputation, reads like something from a mental hospital with no doctors or nurses.

The 31-page “Summary for Policymakers” of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change announced the authors’ stunning concession that computer-modeled forecasts of imminent planetary catastrophe were catastrophically wrong – global surface temperatures haven’t risen significantly in the last 15 years – but, even with many other doubts, also insisted that the IPCC is more confident than ever that global warming is mainly humans’ fault.

Then European Union Climate Change Commissioner Connie Hedegaard told the London Telegraph that EU policy on global warming is right even if the science is wrong. That’s nuts, but that’s Big Green: Facts don’t matter.

I asked climate realist Marc Morano, publisher of Climate Depot and former Senate Environment and Public Works professional staff member, whether the leaked IPCC report was indeed full of inconsistencies.

“It is, but you have to pity the UN. The climate events of 2013 have been devastating to its political narrative on global warming,” Morano said.

He reelled off examples as if spooling out crime scene tape: “Both poles have expanding ice, with the Antarctic breaking all time records. Global temperatures have failed to rise for 15-plus years. Global cooling has occurred since 2002. Polar bear numbers are increasing. Wildfire numbers are well below average. Sea level rise is failing to accelerate. Tornadoes are at record lows. Hurricanes are at record low activity.” Case closed.

I complained that none of that was in the IPCC report. Morano indicated that the facts were well known even if obscured by jargon. As a result, “former climate believers like Judith Curry are growing more skeptical by the day,” Morano said.

It’s true. Judith Curry, head of climate science at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, this week published her analysis of the leaked IPCC draft report – and it sparked an international Twitter war.
"In view of the recent pause [in warming] and the lower confidence level in some of the supporting findings," Curry said, it therefore made no sense that the IPCC was claiming that its confidence in its forecasts and conclusions has increased. "This is incomprehensible to me," she said. "The science is clearly not settled, and is in a state of flux."

All this business about "confidence" sounds like a sophomoric game because it is. It's the IPCC's consensus-seeking process at work. Consensus is a group decision-making process that seeks the consent of all participants, and it is not part of the scientific method. It gained popularity in the women's liberation and anti-nuclear movements of the 1970s.

The only advantage of consensus-seeking for the IPCC is the political clout of being able to say, "The scientific consensus is...", thereby totally undercutting the views of non-IPCC scientists.

Its disadvantage to science is that nobody knows by an up-and-down vote who disagrees with major pieces of the science and why, instead devising a scale of "confidence" for each set of results: "weakly confident," "moderately confident," and "extremely confident" — like marking your kids' heights on the kitchen wall with "short," "taller" and "way tall."

Curry recommended that the consensus-seeking IPCC process be abandoned for a more traditional review, saying, "I think that arguments for and against would better support scientific progress, and be more useful for policy makers."

One of the report's authors, professor Myles Allen, director of Oxford University's Climate Research Network, said, "The idea of producing a document of near-biblical infallibility is a misrepresentation of how science works." He recommended this IPCC report be the last.

With all the economic pain, social divisiveness and resource misdirection the IPCC has caused, the 195 governments that funded it should get their money back.

*Ron Arnold, a Washington Examiner columnist, is executive vice president of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise.*

**Web URL:** http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/2536082
The human race has prospered by relying on forecasts that the seasons will follow their usual course, while knowing they will sometimes be better or worse. Are things different now?

For the fifth time now, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change claims they are. The difference, the IPCC asserts, is increased human emissions of carbon dioxide: a colorless, odorless, non-toxic gas that is a byproduct of growing prosperity. It is also a product of all animal respiration and is also essential for most life on Earth; yet in total, it makes up only 0.0004 of the atmosphere.

The IPCC assumes that the relatively small human contribution of this gas to the atmosphere will cause global warming, and insists that the warming will be dangerous.

Other scientists contest the IPCC assumptions, on the grounds that the climatological effect of increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide is trivial—and that the climate is so complex and insufficiently understood that the net effect of human emissions on global temperatures cannot be forecasted.
The computer models that the authors of the IPCC reports rely on are complicated representations of the assumption that human carbon dioxide emissions are now the primary factor driving climate change and will substantially overheat the Earth. The models include many assumptions that mainstream scientists question.

The modelers have correctly stated that they produce scenarios, not forecasts. Scenarios are stories constructed from a collection of assumptions. Well-constructed scenarios can be very convincing, in the same way that a well-crafted fictional book or film can be.

The IPCC and its supporters promote these scary scenarios as if they were forecasts. However, scenarios are neither forecasts nor the product of a validated forecasting method.

The IPCC modelers were apparently unaware of decades of forecasting research. Our audit of the procedures used to create their apocalyptic scenarios found that they violated 72 of 89 relevant scientific forecasting principles. Would you go ahead with your flight, if you overheard two of the ground crew discussing how the pilot had skipped 80 percent of the pre-flight safety checklist?

Thirty-nine forecasting experts from many disciplines around the world developed the forecasting principles from published experimental research. A further 123 forecasting experts reviewed the work. The principles were published in 2001. They are freely available on the Internet, to help forecasters produce the best forecasts they can, and help forecast users determine the validity of forecasts. These principles are the only published set of evidence-based standards for forecasting.

Global warming alarmists nevertheless claim that the "nearly all" climate scientists believe that dangerous global warming will occur. This is a strange claim, in view of the fact more than 30,000 American scientists signed the Oregon Petition, stating that there is no basis for dangerous manmade global warming forecasts and "no convincing evidence" that carbon dioxide is dangerously warming the planet or disrupting its climate.

Most importantly, computer models and scenarios are not evidence -- and validation does not consist of adding up votes. Such an approach can only be detrimental to the advancement of scientific knowledge. Validation requires comparing predictions to actual observations, and the IPCC models have failed in that regard.

Given the expensive policies proposed and implemented in the name of preventing dangerous manmade global warming, we are astonished that there is only one published peer-reviewed paper that claims to provide scientific forecasts of long-range global mean temperatures. The paper is our own 2009 article in the International Journal of Forecasting.

Our paper examined the state of knowledge and available empirical (that is, actually measured) data, in order to select appropriate evidence-based procedures for long-range forecasting of global mean temperatures. Given the complexity and uncertainty of the situation, we concluded that the "no-trend" model is the proper method to use. The conclusion is based on a substantial body of research that found that complex models do not work well in complex and uncertain situations.

This finding might be puzzling to people who are unfamiliar with the research on forecasting. So we tested the no-trend model, using the same data that the IPCC uses, since forecasting principles require that models be validated by comparing them to actual observations.

To do this, we produced annual forecasts from one to 100 years ahead, starting from 1851 and stepping forward year-by-year until 1975, the year before the current warming alarm was raised. (This is also the year when Newsweek and other magazines reported that scientists were "almost unanimous" that Earth faced a new period of global cooling.) We conducted the same analysis for the IPCC scenario of temperatures increasing at a rate of 0.03 degrees Celsius (0.05 degrees Fahrenheit) per year in response to increasing human carbon dioxide emissions.

This procedure yielded 7,550 forecasts for each method. The findings?

Overall, the no-trend forecast error was one-seventh the error of the IPCC scenario's projection. They were as accurate as or more accurate than the IPCC temperatures for all forecast horizons. Most important, the relative accuracy of the no-trend forecasts increased for longer horizons. For example,
the no-trend forecast error was one-twelfth that of the IPCC temperature scenarios for forecasts 91 to 100 years ahead.

Our research in progress scrutinizes more forecasting methods, uses more and better data, and extends our validation tests. The findings strengthen the conclusion that there are no scientific forecasts that predict dangerous global warming.

Is it surprising that the government would support an alarm lacking scientific support? Not really. In our study of situations that are analogous to the current alarm over scenarios of global warming, we identified 26 earlier movements based on scenarios of manmade disaster, including the global cooling alarm in the 1960s to 1970s. None of them were based on scientific forecasts. And yet, governments imposed costly policies in response to 23 of them. In no case did the forecast of major harm come true.

There is no support from scientific forecasting for an upward trend in temperatures, or a downward trend. Without support from scientific forecasts, the global warming alarm is baseless and should be ignored.

Government programs, subsidies, taxes, and regulations proposed as responses to the global warming alarm result in misallocations of valuable resources. They lead to inflated energy prices, declining international competitiveness, disappearing industries and jobs, and threats to health and welfare.

Humanity can do better with the old, simple, tried-and-true no-trend climate forecasting model. This traditional method is also consistent with scientific forecasting principles.

Dr. Kesten C. Green is with the University of South Australia in Adelaide and is director of the major website on forecasting methods, www.forecastingPrinciples.com, and has published twelve peer-reviewed articles on forecasting. Professor J. Scott Armstrong teaches at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia and is a founder of the two major journals on forecasting methods, editor of the Principles of Forecasting handbook, and the world's most highly cited author on forecasting methods. Dr. Willie Soon of Salem, MA for the past 20 years has published extensively on solar and other factors that cause climate changes. Copies of the authors' climate forecasting papers are available at www.PublicPolicyForecasting.com.

Photo credit: DonkeyHotey (Creative Commons)
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Dr. Wendy Ring will speak about how climate change affects our health in the US and what we can do about it. She will share 5 simple steps our country can take to stabilize the climate and save millions of Americans from our top 5 killer diseases. Everyone is welcome.

The goals of this national tour are:
1) to reach out to new audiences not already active on climate issues, particularly conservatives and people in the demographic groups whose health is disproportionately affected by climate change
2) to educate and encourage more health professionals to be vocal about climate and health
3) to get as many health professionals as possible to sign our Prescription for Climate Action, and deliver the signed prescriptions to their respective Congresspeople when we arrive in Washington

Please encourage your friends and family in the healthcare industry to attend with you.
Climate change is a danger to human health already causing death and disease at home and abroad. If we continue “business as usual,” our nation’s greenhouse gas emissions will undermine international efforts, raise the earth’s temperature beyond our ability to adapt, and cause death and suffering for billions of people. This unthinkable tragedy can only be avoided by swift enactment of comprehensive national policy to shift us from dependence on fossil fuels to a more sustainable way of life. Investment in this transformation will be more than repaid by significant decreases in health spending due to cleaner air and increased physical activity. As health professionals pledged to protect the health of our communities, we endorse this prescription for climate action and a livable future.

**OUR VISION OF A HEALTHY FUTURE**
**BY 2030**

50% decrease in motor vehicle emissions
- Align US fuel economy standards with EU and Japan by 2016
- Maintain parity with the nation which has the most advanced fuel economy thereafter
- 20% of new cars sales to be Zero Emissions Vehicles (10% by 2020)

50% of all electricity generated from clean renewable sources.
- Immediate halt to construction of new coal burning power plants, fossil fuel exports, and exploration for fossil fuels
- National Renewable Portfolio Standard (30% by 2020, 50% by 2030)
- Transfer all fossil fuel and food biofuel subsidies to non-combustion alternative energy and increase by inflation + 2%/ year until national portfolio is 100% renewable and sustainable
- Speed up EPA regulation of major GHG polluters (new power plants and fugitive methane by 2014, existing plants by 2015).
- Put a price on carbon which reflects its true cost to society and reward alternative generators for the health benefits of clean energy with priority grid access and feed in tariffs.

40% of all daily trips made by walking, cycling, or public transit.
- Remove federal housing loan restrictions on commercial space that prevent development of affordable mixed use neighborhoods.
- Increase percent of federal transportation funds for active transportation from 1% to 5%
- Increase federal transportation dollars for public transit from 17% to 30%
- Increase active/public transit funding by inflation plus 1%/year until mode share target is achieved.
- Decrease state match for active/public transportation to less than match for highways
- Increase gas tax if necessary in order to make these investments
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

Please read and consider ch. 10 "The Best and Absurd Energy Policy"
also see website at enicgrimsrud.com

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:
Name: ....................................................
Organization: ...........................................
Address: ..................................................
City, State, Zip: ...........................................

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

1. I sincerely believe that building multiple solar power plants is the answer to our high CO2 emission problems and our shrinking and polluting earth. Solar power drastically will lower CO2 levels.
2. Create new jobs to replace (and increase?) the coal mining and oil drilling jobs we have presently.
3. Can we can use money from eliminating oil and coal company tax breaks to fund at least some of the first (or additional) solar power plants. Germany is already thriving using and having built numerous solar power plants.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Teresa X. Nevinis
Organization: Self

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

We need a curriculum throughout our state that teaches about our world and environment (not just test taking skills) First, develop a simulation game for kids, connect this game experience to an assessment of learning.

Step 1. What is the problem?
Step 2. What are solutions?
Step 3. Implement solutions.
Step 4. Evaluate & communicate about above process (i.e. CBA currently done in WA Elem. Schools) Communicate not just in writing but to entire community in a variety of media & modalities.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:
Name: Carol Bryan
Organization: Retired teacher

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to
Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup

by
Timothy J. Coleman
Kettle Range Conservation Group
P.O. Box 150
Republic, Washington 99166

I provide the following testimony on behalf of Republic-based Kettle Range Conservation Group. Kettle Range Conservation Group is a member supported grassroots conservation group founded in 1976. We are concerned about potential climate impacts to forest ecosystems, water quality and quantity that make Washington such a special place to live.

The impacts of climate change are already upon us. Warmer winters and drier summers have had a significant impact in the spread of mountain pine beetle and spruce bark beetles in the Kettle River Mountains and around my home in Ferry County.

We ask that you maintain a renewable energy standards, clean fuels standard and while addressing carbon pricing structures.

Drought and storm damage costs millions in emergency services and lost business. It is up to us today, to make sure our children’s future is not a routine yearly series of environmental catastrophes. A flood that hit Ferry County in May 1998 temporarily isolated Republic and closed SR 20 for nearly the entire summer, significantly impacting tourism. Then in 2012, a terrifying windstorm hit western Ferry County in late July that leveled forests from Keller to Curlew. That storm was preceded a week earlier by a storm that dropped 3” of rain in a half hour. And science tells us this is just the tip of the iceberg.

I appreciate Governor Inslee and members of the House and Senate for convening a public process. However I do not agree the process should be used to override the will of the voters or I-937 and instead be used to strengthen Washington State’s green economy.

Adaptation to a green economy will result in tens of thousands of jobs in addition to those that already exist – while climate shift to warmer winters threaten irrigated agriculture, forest products industry, and recreation & tourism. Energy efficiency is the cheapest form of conservation and it put people to work.

Washington should put more investment in solar power, including photovoltaic and solar-thermal power generation, and include incentives to locate power production close to power use, such as on building rooftops, to reduce transmission loss – an inherent weakness in grid power, even from hydro.

Testimony of Timothy J. Coleman, Kettle Range Conservation Group – to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup. October 16, 2013
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):
Governor John Spellman was my hero when he stood up to big oil companies and said no, you can't have Cherry Point, Please do this again! No coal or big export terminals in Cherry Point or Vancouver, Wa. It's time to end coal for energy here in Washington & in export form to Asia. The world needs renewable energy sources other than fossil fuels was very effective. It sparked new ideas about renewable resources. Unfortunately Pres. Reagan ended this. I would like to see this state give incentives to businesses & private citizens who use renewable energy sources.

For businesses this could be the form of tax incentives. When President Clinton left office he formed an organization to look at alternative energy use & energy conservation measures. They refitted the Empire State building to use much less energy with great results. I think the answer to our energy problems may lie in not one large answer, but in communities looking for regional solutions & individuals, towns & businesses looking to how they use energy.

Nuclear energy is not an option here. We have the nation's largest waste dump @ Hanford, where clean-up issues will plague future generations for thousands of years.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: [Judy Amy]
Organization: [private citizen & Sierra Club member]

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

The State has vehicle miles travelled goals, but little or no mechanism to obtain compliance. This is confirmed by a recent appeal case, Cascadia Bike Club v. Puget Sound Regional Council, 175 Wn. App. 494 (2013). States need to ensure that counties, cities, and other agencies are required to adopt plans to take action to really reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMTs). Current law doesn't assign responsibility to agencies to work together to create a system where each local government has a duty to reduce VMT. Methods: 1) Growing Management Act. (GMA) Used it to curb urban sprawl in A. Inverse GMA to (GHA) use it to curb urban sprawl. Amend the GHA to make explicit what is already implicit: urban growth areas need to be as small as possible to avoid greenhouse gas emissions. 2) Rider law so that where those laws apply to the reduce urban sprawl (e.g., GHA) they apply to the reduce urban sprawl (e.g., GHA). These laws need to change. New law so that where those laws apply to the reduce urban sprawl (e.g., GHA) they apply to the reduce urban sprawl (e.g., GHA). These laws need to change. New

*Please continue on back or attach pages if needed*

Optional Information:

Name: Ludy C. Carle

Organization: Becklin & Bowman, LLP

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup  
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

I moved away from the footloose and oil companies of Texas to WA State to seek a healthier way of life. However, the clean air and environment I trust been in eastern WA is now in danger of becoming more and more like the polluted environment I left behind in Texas.

Therefore, I beseech you to do whatever you can to preserve the quality of life for WA's citizens that includes clean air and water. Please continue to set an example for other states and a global economy.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Katherine Smith

Organization:

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at:
climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

Dream, plan and action.
 live into the reduction by modeling the reduction
in all of our buildings, at all events, in addition
 to creating a system of bike trails in communities
 keeping our bikers safe.
 Reduce our carbon load in the state. Be
 proactive with a plan — this is called "risk
 management" — believe in possibilities.
 We can save money, live better, re-think-energy.
 If we believe we can or we believe we can't
 we are right.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Evita Krshock
Organization: The Faith and Environment Network

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at:
climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

California cap & trade has provided green jobs and an expanding sector that held through the recession. The 3 agencies who did research for your group need 2013 updates on how well the system is working (auction, business participation, oversight, income to state). (Also penalties for speculation - no more earnings)

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Carol Ellis
Organization: [Redacted]

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

Fund K-12 STEM programs in public schools that focus on renewable energy, Earth systems, sustainability, and science methods.

Support the Next Generation Science Standards by providing interdisciplinary education (training programs for in-service) for future educators.

Find ways to make "small" changes towards energy reduction programs and sustainability; affordable and accessible to average/low income citizens. Many of my students are aware of "clean living" and sustainability but, cannot afford to make positive changes.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Jennifer Barson
Organization: Spokane Falls Community College - Geology Instructor
Address:  
City, State, Zip: Spokane, WA

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
October 16, 2013

Governor Inslee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please include these comments in the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup deliberations.

Spokane County’s children increasingly risk respiratory afflictions and mercury exposure from toxic railway diesel fumes and other greenhouse gas emissions.

Washington’s oyster seeds can’t form their shells and starfish (sea stars) disintegrate into goo. The oceans’ increased acidity is said to be due to carbon dioxide emissions from burning fossil fuels. Marine life on which billions of people depend for food and jobs is imperiled. Fish from inland waters is unsafe for consumption.

How does all that concern Spokane County residents? We are connected with all life forms fundamentally requiring clean air and pure water. Protect these critical assets.

Accordingly, support every possible economic incentive for clean non-coal energy, attendant jobs and fresh air. Help move utilities away from coal-generated power. Strengthen effective land use regs for compact and connected communities and reduced sprawl to enable 2008 GHG compliance.

Further, since 50% of Washington’s global warming pollution (about 50 million metric tons annually) comes from transportation sectors, put solutions on the table that both reduce our transportation pollution and give us more choices to get around safely, reliably. Minimize roads in wild places.

Lastly, implement and ensure these fundamental rights to all, regardless of our differences. Ensure their distribution equitably, fairly. Do not extinguish them but instead support and maintain an environment that honors all living things. Expect resolution in amazing ways, envisioning solutions that serve the highest and best for all.

Thank you.

Mary Jokela
35417 N. Dalton Road
Deer Park, WA 99006
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup  
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Tyler Pugh
Organization: Unaffiliated

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

We need to stop exporting manufacturing jobs to China which enriches their military and enables China to fund some $20 trillion of our $17 trillion national debt. Will they someday march in saying “We own you now”? Why are jobs leaving US? Could it be partly because of excessive govt. regs & taxes? What about union demands?

There was no mention of chem trails which pollute the land, make it harder to grow food, and may kill some honeybees, and make the sky hazy. What's the purpose of chem trails? To reflect sunlight back to space - cut down on global warming?

By the way, in Spain, for every green job created, there was 5 regular jobs lost. Don't let that happen here.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:
Name: Laura Carter
Organization:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spokane, WA

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
October 16, 2013

Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
Public Hearing #1
Spokane, Washington

Members of the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup,

I’m here today from Environmental Entrepreneurs (E2), a national community of business leaders who promote sound environmental policy that builds economic prosperity. E2 is the independent business voice for the environment. Our Pacific Northwest chapter looks forward to providing support to your work. We are especially interested in driving forward a Clean Fuels Program and a Zero Emission Vehicle Program, as we believe our business-as-usual approach to petroleum hurts our economy.

A clean fuels program and zero emission vehicle program are symbiotic programs, each one providing incentives to meet the other program’s goals of fuel diversification, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and more fuel efficiency.

I’m here today as E2’s expert on clean fuel standards, and the importance of Washington creating such a program. Washington would be a very early adopter of this program, showing the country that Washington is clearly an environmental leader. We would also show that encouraging innovation in the fuels sector has economic benefits, especially to the states that implement such a program early.

E2 conducts an annual review of the status of the advanced biofuel industry.¹ This year one of our key takeaways is that the growth of the advanced biofuel industry is driven primarily by federal and state policies. There are several biofuel companies already in Washington that would benefit from such a program, and many other companies would look at locating facilities in state as a result of a clean fuels market.

The only other examples of a Clean Fuels Program are in California and British Columbia. Those programs are working as intended, with obligated parties over-complying in the early years of the standard – as much as 60% this year.² New fuels have entered the market, greenhouse gas emissions are being reduced, and there is a strong credit price. Since the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision that California may proceed with its low carbon fuel standard, credit prices have risen and remained above $70/ton, demonstrating market confidence. That $70/ton gives a healthy return to alternative fuel providers – about 60 cents for a gallon of advanced biofuel – but once blended, costs have less than one penny of impact on the final

² 2013 LCFS Reporting Tool. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/20130930_q2datasummary.pdf>
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

The legislation which created this group is almost 6 years old. Many things have changed dramatically. Our economy is in a downturn. Many businesses no longer operate or at least do so in a much smaller capacity. A carbon tax, cap and trade, emissions penalty would all have a negative impact on struggling businesses as well as individuals/families whose incomes have taken a severe hit in the last few years. Please, consider financially strapped people when implementing any new policy. I have not seen this addressed in the reports that have been issued to date (taken from CLEW website). If other states do not implement the same policies we will be at a disadvantage competitively. Also, WA state

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: SUE WILSON

Organization: .................................................................

Email: ..............................................................................

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@cew.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

IN ADDITION TO INCREASING USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES, I'D LIKE TO SEE MORE INCENTIVES FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY, USE OF PUBLIC TRANSIT, AND A STRONG REGULATORY FRAMEWORK TO PROTECT CONSUMERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AS A LOW-INCOME CONSUMER, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF EVEN MODERATELY PRICED ENERGY SAVINGS. SINCE MY HEATING BILL IS PAID FOR BY MEDICAID & HEN, I ACTUALLY HAVE NO INCENTIVE TO REDUCE MY ENERGY USE. ALTHOUGH I'M LOW INCOME, I'M NOT AN ANESTA CUSTOMER, SO I CAN'T GET A HOME ENERGY AUDIT. THERMAL CURTAINS COST MORE THAN A CHEAP HEATER, SO GUESS HOW I'LL BE KEEPING WARM THIS WINTER.

PUBLIC TRANSIT I TAKE THE BUS, AND I'M NOT PHYSICALLY DISABLED, WHILE STA (MY LOCAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY) IS MAKING A LOT OF IMPROVEMENTS IN USAGE, LITTLE IS DONE TO ENCOURAGE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT. LITTLE IS DONE TO ENCOURAGE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT.

Optional Information:

Name: BRIANNA CHESSER
Organization: SELF
Address: SPOKANE WA 99204
City, State, Zip: SPOKANE WA 99204
Email: 

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

As we develop policies programs to address global climate change disruption, it is especially important to include solutions for existing building stock. It is necessary to consider the impact energy efficiency programs can have on the local economy and workforce. We wish to express our hope that the Climate Workgroup supports cost-effective delivery of energy efficiency measures, and does so while supporting quality job growth in Washington's clean energy economy. Investment in Community Energy Efficiency Programs, like Sustainable Works in Spokane, capitalize on already established community partnerships with utilities, municipalities, building owners, and civic organizations to provide resources to

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Tessa Lilot

Organization: Sustainable Works

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

The IPCC just released a new report stating that climate change is happening and beyond a reasonable doubt humans are causing it. Coal exports from terminals in Washington state will greatly harm the environment. This coal exporting will have greater harm to our environment than the Keystone Pipeline. The huge ships used to take millions of tons of coal to China will need to be weighted with millions of gallons of bilge water to get the ships back to Washington state. This bilge water will be dumped in Washington waters. If these are any non-native invasive species in that bilge water it will be a disaster to our environment.

The Trans Pacific Partnership if fast tracked and enacted will eliminate Washington States ability to regulate greenhouse gasses, multinational corporations will be able to sue state and local governments for loss of estimated profits without using U.S. court system but will be decided by arbitration of corporate lawyers with possibility of appeal. This will subordinate any government, Federal, State or local to corporate control. Washington must pass TPP Free zone legislation.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: David Randall
Organization: Citizen

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

China has an air pollution problem that we would only make worse if we allow the coal trains.
Also, the air in Spokane needs to be cleaned up - not made worse by the coal trains.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Gwen Innes

Organization: ..........................................................

Email: ..........................................................

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.
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The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

1. Please oppose the coal trains and the pollution they will contribute to both global warming and locally to the pollution from all the cancer causing diesel.

2. Please institute a carbon tax as P.A.C has done as well as investigate the "Clear Act" to incentivize clean industry as we work toward our goal of reducing greenhouse gas.

3. Any Governor & legislators, please continue to kill any bill that would designate incineration a clean/green energy. The Spokane incinerator produces 98,000 metric tons of greenhouse gas per year.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Pammie Wagner
Organization: Citizens for Clean Air

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):
1. Either eliminate coal-fired power plants, or severely control airborne emissions from those plants.
2. Require homes and businesses that use wood for heating to have chimney scrubbers.
3. Establish electric recharging stations along I-5 and I-90.
4. High-speed rail between Seattle and Spokane with ability to load your car on the train.
5. Subsidies for upgrading homes and businesses to heating efficiency standards.
6. Require rail carriers to cover any particulate cargo (coal, grain, etc.).
7. Encourage exploration of thorium-based nuclear plants.
8. Concentrate urban growth and limit suburban sprawl.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: [Signature]

Organization:

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.
If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at:
climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Dear Climate Workgroup:

We all require clear air, clean water, fertile soil and sunshine in order to survive, in a healthy manner, on planet Earth. We all know this. Yet amongst us are those who would compete for the greater share of our resources without regard for the good of all, for the common wealth, for the infrastructure that humans have organized for the good of all. This aggressive, self-aggrandizing attitude has undermined the general well-being of the entire planet, creating fear, hatred, destruction and genocide of other cultures. Beginning with a psychological awakening of our own shortcomings and lack of awareness of essential social and biological structures, we must alter our present destructive course and adopt a cooperative relationship with our people and our environment. We can all survive and live quite comfortably through cooperation, while

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Hollis Higgins
Organization: Veterans For Peace, Spokane Chapter #35

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

We need to increase solar & wind power, not H2O power. We can look to Europe for some of their innovations - supporting solar power on homes with financial incentives increasing public transportation & bicycle friendly cities.

Let’s also use conservation - better cars (better gas mileage), less emphasis on increasing our roads, but what we really need is better public transportation.

We need financial support for insulating our older homes & buildings.

We do not want more H2O power (we want to support our salmon & fisheries) nor do we want nuclear (dirty, dangerous & not sustainable).

Not should we support the export of coal or the mining of coal in other states to be transported through our state.

We have seen all the stats re: climate change. Let’s do our part to alleviate it.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: [Name]

Organization: [Organization]

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at:
climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

- Innovation in renewable energy sources will bring clean jobs as well as cleaner air.
- Statewide mass transit, trains, rapid transit, bike paths should be a priority.
- NO COAL
- OMBAN
- Clean fuel standard
- Urban growth plans should minimize need for new roads.
- Energy efficiency programs to help conserve waste not want is a great motto.
- Carbon tax - level playing field

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**
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Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.
Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup  
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

I am the Development Director for First Wind, the owner and operator of the 105 MW Palouse Wind project 30 miles South of Spokane. I am a direct beneficiary of a clean economy. WA policies such as the RPS, sales tax exemptions, and apprenticeship programs have created jobs and clean energy.

Palouse Wind employs 15 full time workers. We used over 640 people during construction, 40 local contractors, and over 16,900 man hours. Palouse Wind invested millions locally and continues to source goods and services.

It did all this while producing enough energy for 30,000 Avista customers. We need to repeat.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Ben Fairbanks
Organization: First Wind - Palouse Wind Project - 105 MW Whitman County
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Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

We must make the necessary changes to turn climate change. We must limit the coal trains through Washington. My grandson's future is at stake.

Please increase public transit. I cycle 2000 mi a year & am 68.

Please consider conservation.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**
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The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

I am here to learn. I am worried about the impact of coal shipped by rail through the city of Cheney. The problem is so much more complex than I could even imagine. Encouraged by the creative solutions offered in this hearing, I hope you will be able to encourage legislation that supports clean new industries.

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:
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Organization: [Redacted]

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing.

If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
October 16, 2013

Governor Inslee
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Re: Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup (CLEW) Hearing on Climate Change Comments

Dear Governor Inslee:

I am writing on behalf of Gonzaga University Environmental Law Clinic.

The Gonzaga Environmental Law Clinic provides legal representation to not-for-profit environmental programs in the Inland Northwest, and strives to protect and restore the quality and integrity of the region’s waters through advocacy and public interest litigation.

All across the country a movement is spreading called Atmospheric Trust Litigation (ATL). People are bringing lawsuits against their state governments to force them to reduce carbon emissions to curtail global warming. Currently, an ATL case is waiting review in our own state by the Washington State Court of Appeals. http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/WA%20Reply%20Brief%20PR%20.pdf

The appellants in this case are requesting that the government prepare an emissions reduction plan that reduces emissions by a minimum of 6% annually, and eventually get down to 350 parts per million (ppm) of CO2 concentration in the atmosphere. (Today, concentration is at 392 ppm). http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/WA_Hansen_Declaration.pdf. Dr. James Hansen, a leading climate scientist who directs the NASA Institute for Space Studies, submitted a declaration supporting the plaintiffs http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/WA%20Reply%20Brief%20PR%20.pdf. In the declaration, he states that: “[This request] is consistent with current scientific understanding of what is minimally needed to avert dangerous climate change and to preserve a habitable climate system.” http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/WA_Hansen_Declaration.pdf.

“To demonstrate the urgency of the issue at hand, the required rate of emissions reduction would have been about 3.5% per year if reductions had started in 2005, while the required rate of reduction, if commenced in 2020 will be approximately 15% per year.” http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/WA_Hansen_Declaration.pdf.

So, today I am asking that you, Governor, enter into a consent decree in this case that has measurable court enforceable limits to try to reach the 6% reduction of CO2 emissions.
As Dr. Hansen says: “Unless action is undertaken without further delay to return the atmospheric concentration of CO2 to 350 ppm by 2100, Earth’s climate system will be pressed toward and past points of no return. Effective action remains possible, but delay in undertaking sharp reductions will undermine any realistic chance of preserving a habitable climate system” for future generations. http://ourchildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/ WA_Hansen_Declaration.pdf.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Samantha Zimmerman
Law Clerk
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2. dangers to Spokane aquifer with railroad trestles over smth end of Lake Pend Oreille (velocities to Longview/Cherry Pt)

3. job creation with CA's SBIR program (Cap & Trade) through the recession

4. article on BC's successful carbon policy

Sustainable Prosperity website

Ottawa, CANADA
Global average sea level has increased 8 inches since 1880. Sea levels along the U.S. East Coast and Gulf of Mexico are rising much faster.

Local Sea Level Rise
1880-Present

The rate of local sea level rise varies depending on both global and local factors, including currents, ocean floor topography, variations in ocean density, and land uplift or subsidence due to geological reasons or human activities.

© Union of Concerned Scientists 2013: www.ucsusa.org/sealevelrise
Global warming is the primary cause of current sea level rise.

- Temperatures are rising: Heat-trapping gases from human activity have increased global average temperatures by 1.4°F since the 1880s.
- Ice is melting: Shrinking glaciers and ice sheets are adding water to the world’s oceans.
- Oceans are warming: Sea water expands as its temperature rises.

Contributions to global sea level rise (1972-2008):
- Melting land ice: 52%
- Warmer oceans: 38%
- Other: 10%

© Union of Concerned Scientists 2013; www.ucsusa.org/sealevelrise
Sat 9/28/13, I drove along Lake Pend Oreille and the Clarkfork River to Superior MT, following the rail tacks.

ISSUES:

The Spo/Rathdrum SOLE SOURCE aquifer begins at the S end of Lake Pend Oreille and serves 1/2 Million folks

The Clarkfork River aquifer is alongside and below the tracks, likely under the tracks as well

Trestles cross Pend Oreille Lake 4-5 times VISIBLY near the s end - likely more I could not see

Trestles and bridges cross Clarkfork River 5 times, likely more

At Thompson Falls the track is parallel to the state highway thru town.

ALSO THE OIL REFUEL seems to be at Thompson Falls IN THE CITY. Missoula also has refueling tanks, how close to University and hospital in the middle of town?

The parallel track system DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ADEQUATE FOR THE VOLUME OF TRAINS TO PASS EACH OTHER. The public needs this info on the length of switching and parallel tracks

CONCLUSION

EPA ought to be involved on a 4 state basis for water drainage and aquifers!

Commerce Department ought to be involved for interstate rail issues.

3 of 4 governors can appeal for Army Corps of engineers not doing adequate system-wide EIS, and separating from WA DOE, especially on Longview terminal. Appeal if they won't work with WA DOE on Cherry Point.

4 states NEED MORE INFORMATION ON RAILROAD INFRASTRUCTURE, PARALLEL TRACKS, SWITCHING YARDS, AND FUELING DEPOTS.
Sat 9/28/13, I drove along Lake Pend Oreille and the Clarkfork River to Superior MT, following the rail tacks.

ISSUES:

The Spo/Rathdrum SOLE SOURCE aquifer begins at the S end of Lake Pend Oreille and serves 1/2 Million folks

The Clarkfork River aquifer is alongside and below the tracks, likely under the tracks as well

Trestles cross Pend Oreille Lake 4-5 times VISIBLY near the s end - likely more I could not see

Trestles and bridges cross Clarkfork River 5 times, likely more

At Thompson Falls the track is parallel to the state highway thru town.

ALSO THE OIL REFUEL seems to be at Thompson Falls IN THE CITY. Missoula also has refueling tanks, how close to University and hospital in the middle of town?

The parallel track system DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ADEQUATE FOR THE VOLUME OF TRAINS TO PASS EACH OTHER. The public needs this info on the length of switching and parallel tracks

CONCLUSION

EPA ought to be involved on a 4 state basis for water drainage and aquifers!

Commerce Department ought to be involved for interstate rail issues.

3 of 4 governors can appeal for Army Corps of engineers not doing adequate system-wide EIS, and separating from WA DOE, especially on Longview terminal. Appeal if they won't work with WA DOE on Cherry Point.

4 states NEED MORE INFORMATION ON RAILROAD INFRASTRUCTURE, PARALLEL TRACKS, SWITCHING YARDS, AND FUELING DEPOTS.
FIGURE 1
Employment growth relative to 1995: California

Source: Collaborative Economics, "Seven Growth Sectors Driving California's Clean and Efficient Economy," May 2012

FIGURE 2
Seven growth sectors driving California's employment

July 24, 2013

By: Jonathan Fowlie & Tiffany Crawford

B.C.'s fuel consumption has dropped significantly since the carbon tax was brought in five years ago, according to a study released Wednesday, the same day premiers meet in Ontario to discuss a national energy strategy.

Topping the premiers' energy agenda in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont., is a discussion of how to lower carbon emissions, and the author of the report wants the premiers to note that B.C.'s plan is working.

The report, by an Ottawa-based think-tank called Sustainable Prosperity, found that from July 1, 2008, the date the carbon tax took effect, to July 1, 2012, B.C.'s fuel consumption fell by 17.4 per cent, and nearly 18 per cent per capita compared with the rest of Canada.

By contrast, over the same period, consumption rose 1.5 per cent in the rest of the country.

Also during that time, the province's gross domestic product kept pace with the rest of the country, the report found.

The author of the study, Stewart Elgie, a professor of law and economics at University of Ottawa, argues B.C. has successfully reduced fossil fuel consumption without damaging the economy.

"B.C.'s experience shows that it is possible to have both a healthier environment and a strong economy — by taxing pollution and lowering income taxes," said Elgie, in a statement.

Elgie admits that the changes in fossil fuel use may not all be due to the carbon tax, but he said a meaningful part of it is because of the levy.

Canada's premiers are meeting today through Friday to discuss a proposed Canadian energy strategy which includes a more integrated approach to climate change.

"I hope that B.C.'s success will inspire Canada's premiers to show leadership on a national approach to pricing carbon pollution," said Elgie.

Apart from B.C., Alberta and Quebec also have carbon taxes.

The report will be published in the next edition of the journal Canadian Public Policy.

Related Materials:

POLICY AND RESEARCH CLUSTERS

© 2008-2013 Sustainable Prosperity. All Rights Reserved.
Climate Change
Reconsidered II

Full PDF Link

heartland.org/media-library/pdfs/CCR-II/CCR-II-Full.pdf
Climate Change
Reconsidered II
Physical Science

Summary for Policymakers
About NIPCC and Its Previous Reports

The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, or NIPCC, as its name suggests, is an international panel of scientists and scholars who came together to understand the causes and consequences of climate change. NIPCC has no formal attachment to or sponsorship from any government or governmental agency. It is wholly independent of political pressures and influences and therefore is not predisposed to produce politically motivated conclusions or policy recommendations.

NIPCC seeks to objectively analyze and interpret data and facts without conforming to any specific agenda. This organizational structure and purpose stand in contrast to those of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which is government-sponsored, politically motivated, and predisposed to believing that climate change is a problem in need of a U.N. solution.

NIPCC traces its beginnings to an informal meeting held in Milan, Italy in 2003 organized by Dr. S. Fred Singer and the Science & Environmental Policy Project (SEPP). The purpose was to produce an independent evaluation of the available scientific evidence on the subject of carbon dioxide-induced global warming in anticipation of the release of the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). NIPCC scientists concluded the IPCC was biased with respect to making future projections of climate change, discerning a significant human-induced influence on current and past climatic trends, and evaluating the impacts of potential carbon dioxide-induced environmental changes on Earth’s biosphere.

To highlight such deficiencies in the IPCC’s AR4, in 2008 SEPP partnered with The Heartland Institute to produce Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate, a summary of research for policymakers that has been widely distributed and translated into six languages. In 2009, the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change joined the original two sponsors to help produce Climate Change Reconsidered: The 2009 Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), the first comprehensive alternative to the alarmist reports of the IPCC.

In 2010, a Web site (www.nipccreport.org) was created to highlight scientific studies NIPCC scientists believed would likely be downplayed or ignored by the IPCC during preparation of its next assessment report. In 2011, the three sponsoring organizations produced Climate Change Reconsidered: The 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), a review and analysis of new research released since the 2009 report or overlooked by the authors of that report.

In 2013, the Information Center for Global Change Studies, a division of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, translated and published an abridged edition of the 2009 and 2011 NIPCC reports in a single volume. On June 15, the Chinese Academy of Sciences organized a NIPCC Workshop in Beijing to allow the NIPCC principal authors to present summaries of their conclusions.

In September 2013, NIPCC released Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science, the first of two volumes bringing the original 2009 report up-to-date with research from the 2011 Interim Report plus research as current as the third quarter of 2013. A new Web site was created (www.ClimateChangeReconsidered.org) to feature the new report and news about its release. A second volume, Climate Change Reconsidered II: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability, is planned for release in 2014.
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Introduction

Many scientists, policymakers, and engaged citizens have become concerned over the possibility that man-made greenhouse gas emissions, in particular carbon dioxide (CO₂), may be causing dangerous climate change. A primary reason for this public alarm is a series of reports issued by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The IPCC claims to know, apparently with rising certainty over time, that “most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations” (IPCC AR4 SPM, p. 10). This Summary for Policymakers summarizes and interprets a major scientific report that refutes this claim.

The Red Team Reports

A technique frequently used in industry, government, and law when dealing with complex or controversial matters is to deploy competing Green and Red Teams to pursue alternative approaches (e.g., Sandoz, 2001; Nemeth et al., 2001). A Red Team provides a kind of “defense counsel” to verify and counter arguments mounted by the initial Green Team (the “prosecution”) as well as discover and present alternatives the Green Team may have overlooked.

For many years, one team has dominated the global debate over climate change, the Green Team of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). In 2003, however, at a meeting in Milan, a Red Team started to emerge composed of independent scientists drawn from universities and private institutions around the world. Since 2008 that team, the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), has been independently evaluating the impacts of rising atmospheric concentrations of CO₂ on Earth’s biosphere and evaluating forecasts of future climate effects (Singer, 2008; Idso and Singer, 2009; Idso, Carter, and Singer, 2011).

CCR-II: Physical Science

Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science is NIPCC’s latest official report. Lead authors Craig D. Idso, Robert M. Carter, and S. Fred Singer have worked with a team of some 50 scientists to produce a 1,200-page report that is comprehensive, objective, and faithful to the scientific method. It is the first of two volumes that together mirror and rebut the IPCC’s Working Group 1 and Working Group 2 reports, the latter last published in 2007 (Fourth Assessment Report, or AR4) and expected to be updated and released in 2013 and 2014 (Fifth Assessment Report, or AR5). The second volume of CCR-II will address impacts, adaptation, and vulnerabilities.

Like the IPCC’s reports, NIPCC’s reports cite thousands of articles appearing in peer-reviewed science journals relevant to the subject of human-induced climate change. For CCR-II: Physical Science, NIPCC presents its findings in seven chapters:

- Global Climate Models
- Forcings and Feedbacks
- Solar Forcing of Climate
- Observations: Temperature Records
- Observations: The Cryosphere
- Observations: The Hydrosphere and Oceans
- Observations: Extreme Weather

In keeping with its Red Team mission, NIPCC authors paid special attention to contributions that were either overlooked by the IPCC or that contain data,
discussion, or implications arguing against the IPCC’s claim that dangerous global warming is resulting, or will result, from human-related greenhouse gas emissions. Figure 1 on the following page summarizes NIPCC’s principal findings. Most notably, its authors say the IPCC has exaggerated the amount of warming likely to occur if the concentration of atmospheric CO₂ were to double, and such warming as occurs is likely to be modest and cause no net harm to the global environment or to human well-being.

This Summary for Policymakers was written in collaboration with the lead authors and approved by them. It reproduces in a series of figures the executive summary of Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science, which appears at the beginning of that book. Because it is aimed at a larger and more popular audience than the book itself, this summary adds a discussion of the scientific method and the precautionary principle, a brief summary and critical analysis of each of the IPCC’s main lines of argument, and a brief set of recommendations for policymakers.

1. Methodology

The IPCC relies on three lines of reasoning: computer models that it asserts show CO₂ to be responsible for most of the global warming in the twentieth century, a series of postulates that make a plausible case for its hypothesis, and circumstantial evidence that would be consistent with its hypothesis were it true. These IPCC arguments are summarized in Figure 2.

The Scientific Method

Although the IPCC’s reports are voluminous and their arguments impressively persistent, it is legitimate to ask whether that makes them good science. In order to conduct an investigation, scientists must first formulate a falsifiable hypothesis to test. The hypothesis implicit in all IPCC writings, though rarely explicitly stated, is that dangerous global warming is resulting, or will result, from human-related greenhouse gas emissions.

In considering any such hypothesis, an alternative and null hypothesis must be entertained, which is the simplest hypothesis consistent with the known facts. Regarding global warming, the null hypothesis is that currently observed changes in global climate indices and the physical environment, as well as current changes in animal and plant characteristics, are the result of natural variability. To invalidate this null hypothesis requires, at a minimum, direct evidence of human causation of specified changes that lie outside usual, natural variability. Unless and until such evidence is adduced, the null hypothesis is assumed to be correct.

In contradiction of the scientific method, the IPCC assumes its implicit hypothesis is correct and that its only duty is to collect evidence and make plausible arguments in the hypothesis’s favor. One probable reason for this behavior is that the United Nations protocol under which the IPCC operates defines climate change as “a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods” (United Nations, 1994, Article 1.2). Not surprisingly, directing attention to only the effects of human greenhouse gas emissions has resulted in the IPCC failing to provide a thorough analysis of climate change in the round.

All three of the IPCC’s lines of reasoning, summarized in Figure 2, depart from proper scientific methodology. Global climate models produce meaningful results only if we assume we already know perfectly how the global climate works, and most climate scientists say we do not (Bray and von Storch, 2010). Moreover, it is widely recognized that climate models are not designed to produce predictions of future climate but rather what-if projections of many alternative possible futures (Trenberth, 2009). Postulates, commonly defined as “something suggested or assumed as true as the basis for reasoning, discussion, or belief,” can stimulate relevant observations or experiments but more often are merely assertions that are difficult or impossible to test (Kahneman, 2011). Observations in science are useful primarily to falsify hypotheses and cannot prove one is correct (Popper, 1965, p. vii).

The Precautionary Principle

Facing such criticism of its methodology and a lack of compelling evidence of dangerous warming, the IPCC’s defenders often invoke the precautionary principle. The principle states: “Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation” (United Nations, 1992, Principle 15). This is a sociological precept rather than a scientific one and lacks the intellectual rigor necessary for use in policy formulation (Goklany, 2001).
FIGURE 1
Summary of NIPCC’s Findings

- Atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a mild greenhouse gas that exerts a diminishing warming effect as its concentration increases.

- Doubling the concentration of atmospheric CO₂ from its pre-industrial level, in the absence of other forcings and feedbacks, would likely cause a warming of ~0.3 to 1.1°C, almost 50% of which must already have occurred.

- A few tenths of a degree of additional warming, should it occur, would not represent a climate crisis.

- Model outputs published in successive IPCC reports since 1990 project a doubling of CO₂ could cause warming of up to 6°C by 2100. Instead, global warming ceased around the end of the twentieth century and was followed (since 1997) by 16 years of stable temperature.

- Over recent geological time, Earth’s temperature has fluctuated naturally between about +4°C and -6°C with respect to twentieth century temperature. A warming of 2°C above today, should it occur, falls within the bounds of natural variability.

- Though a future warming of 2°C would cause geographically varied ecological responses, no evidence exists that those changes would be net harmful to the global environment or to human well-being.

- At the current level of ~400 ppm we still live in a CO₂-starved world. Atmospheric levels 15 times greater existed during the Cambrian Period (about 550 million years ago) without known adverse effects.

- The overall warming since about 1860 corresponds to a recovery from the Little Ice Age modulated by natural multidecadal cycles driven by ocean-atmosphere oscillations, or by solar variations at the de Vries (~208 year) and Gleissberg (~80 year) and shorter periodicities.

- Earth has not warmed significantly for the past 16 years despite an 8% increase in atmospheric CO₂, which represents 34% of all extra CO₂ added to the atmosphere since the start of the industrial revolution.

- CO₂ is a vital nutrient used by plants in photosynthesis. Increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere “greens” the planet and helps feed the growing human population.

- No close correlation exists between temperature variation over the past 150 years and human-related CO₂ emissions. The parallelism of temperature and CO₂ increase between about 1980 and 2000 AD could be due to chance and does not necessarily indicate causation.

- The causes of historic global warming remain uncertain, but significant correlations exist between climate patterning and multidecadal variation and solar activity over the past few hundred years.

- Forward projections of solar cyclicity imply the next few decades may be marked by global cooling rather than warming, despite continuing CO₂ emissions.

FIGURE 2
IPCC’s Three Lines of Argument

GLOBAL CLIMATE MODEL PROJECTIONS
IPCC modelers assume Global Climate Models (GCMs) are based on a perfect knowledge of all climate forcings and feedbacks. They then assert:

- A doubling of atmospheric CO₂ would cause warming of up to 6°C.
- Human-related CO₂ emissions caused an atmospheric warming of at least 0.3°C over the past 15 years.
- Enhanced warming (a "hot spot") should exist in the upper troposphere in tropical regions.
- Both poles should have warmed faster than the rest of Earth during the late twentieth century.

POSTULATES
Postulates are statements that assume the truth of an underlying fact that has not been independently confirmed or proven. The IPCC postulates:

- The warming of the twentieth century cannot be explained by natural variability.
- The late twentieth century warm peak was of greater magnitude than previous natural peaks.
- Increases in atmospheric CO₂ precede, and then force, parallel increases in temperature.
- Solar forcings are too small to explain twentieth century warming.
- A future warming of 2°C or more would be net harmful to the biosphere and human well-being.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE
Circumstantial evidence does not bear directly on the matter in dispute but refers to circumstances from which the occurrence of the fact might be inferred. The IPCC cites the following circumstantial evidence it says is consistent with its hypothesis:

- Unusual melting is occurring in mountain glaciers, Arctic sea ice, and polar icecaps.
- Global sea level is rising at an enhanced rate and swamping tropical coral atolls.
- Droughts, floods, and monsoon variability and intensity are increasing.
- Global warming is leading to more, or more intense, wildfires, rainfall, storms, hurricanes, and other extreme weather events.
- Unusual melting of Boreal permafrost or sub-seabed gas hydrates is causing warming due to methane release.
The hypothesis of human-caused global warming comes up short not merely of "full scientific certainty" but of reasonable certainty or even plausibility. The weight of evidence now leans heavily against the theory. Invoking the precautionary principle does not lower the required threshold for evidence to be regarded as valid nor does it answer the most important questions about the causes and consequences of climate change. Scientific principles acknowledge the supremacy of experiment and observation and do not bow to instinctive feelings of alarm nor claims of a supposed scientific "consensus" (Legates et al., 2013). The formulation of effective public environmental policy must be rooted in evidence-based science, not an over-abundance of precaution (More and Vita-More, 2013; U.K. House of Commons Science and Technology Committee, 2006).

Contradictions about methodology and the verity of claimed facts make it difficult for unprejudiced lay persons to judge for themselves where the truth actually lies in the global warming debate. This is one of the primary reasons why politicians and commentators rely so heavily on supposedly authoritative statements issued by one side or another in the public discussion. Arguing from authority, however, is the antithesis of the scientific method. Attempting to stifle debate by appealing to authority hinders rather than helps scientific progress and understanding.

2. Global Climate Models

In contrast to the scientific method briefly described in Section 1, computer models (called Global Climate Models or GCMs) represent speculative thought experiments by modellers who often lack a detailed understanding of underlying processes. The results of GCMs are only as reliable as the data and theories "fed" into them, which scientists widely recognize as being seriously deficient. If natural climate forcings and feedback are not perfectly understood, then GCMs become little more than an exercise in curve-fitting, or changing parameters until the outcomes match the modeller's expectations. As John von Neumann is reported to have once said, "with four parameters I can fit an elephant, and with five I can make him wiggle his trunk" (Dyson, 2004).

The science literature is replete with admissions by leading climate modellers that forcings and feedback are not sufficiently well understood, that data are insufficient or too unreliable, and that computer power is insufficient to resolve important climate processes. Many important elements of the climate system cannot be properly simulated by the current generation of models, including atmospheric pressure, wind, clouds, temperature, precipitation, ocean currents, sea ice, and permafrost.

The major known deficiencies include model calibration, non-linear model behavior, and the omission of important natural climate-related variability. Model calibration is faulty as it assumes all temperature rise since the start of the industrial revolution has resulted from human CO2 emissions. In reality, major human-related emissions commenced only in the mid-twentieth century. Non-linear climate models exhibit chaotic behavior. As a result, individual simulations ("runs") may show differing trend values (Singer, 2013b). Internal climate oscillations (AMO, PDO, etc.) are major features of the historic temperature record, yet GCMs do not even attempt to simulate them. Similarly, the models fail to incorporate the effects of variations in solar magnetic field or in the flux of cosmic rays, both phenomena known to significantly affect climate.

In general, GCMs perform poorly when their projections are assessed against empirical data. Specifically, the following forecasts made by GCMs have been falsified by real-world data:

- **IPCC Claim #1**: A doubling of atmospheric CO2 would cause warming between 3°C and 6°C. The increase in radiative forcing produced by a doubling of atmospheric CO2 is generally agreed to be 3.7 Wm⁻². Equating this forcing to temperature requires taking account of both positive and negative feedbacks. IPCC models incorporate a strong positive feedback from increasing water vapor but exclude negative feedbacks such as a concomitant increase in low-level clouds—hence they project a warming effect of 3°C or more.

  The IPCC ignores mounting evidence that climate sensitivity to CO2 is much lower than its models assume. Empirical tests of climate sensitivity to increasing atmospheric CO2 indicate negative feedbacks predominate and associated warming is likely an order of magnitude less than the IPCC projects (Spencer and Braswell, 2008; Lindzen and Choi, 2011). Atmospheric methane (CH4) levels are rising more slowly than predicted and nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions are expected to fall as CO2 concentrations and temperatures rise, a negative climate feedback not taken into account by the IPCC.

  Other forcings and feedbacks the IPCC has failed to take into account include increases in low-level clouds in response to enhanced atmospheric water vapor, ocean emissions of dimethyl sulfide (DMS), and the presence and total cooling effect of both natural and industrial aerosols. These natural processes are likely to offset most
or even all of any warming caused by rising CO₂ concentrations. Figure 3 summarizes these and other findings about forcings and feedbacks appearing in Chapter 2 of CCR-II: Physical Science.

• **IPCC Claim #2:** CO₂ caused an atmospheric warming of at least 0.3°C over the past 15 years. The IPCC’s authors compare the output of unforced (and incomplete) models with a dataset that represents twentieth century global temperature (HadCRUT, British Meteorological Office). Finding a greater warming trend in the dataset than in model projections, the false conclusion is then drawn that this “excess” warming must be caused by human-related greenhouse forcing. In reality, no excess warming has been demonstrated, first because this line of argument assumes models have perfect knowledge, information, and power, which they do not. And second, because a wide variety of datasets other than the HadCRUT global air temperature curve favored by the IPCC do not exhibit a warming trend during the second half of the twentieth century. See Figure 4.

• **IPCC Claim #3:** A thermal hot spot should exist in the upper troposphere in tropical regions. Observations from both weather balloon radiosondes and satellite MSU sensors show the opposite, with either flat or decreasing warming trends with increasing height in the troposphere (Douglass et al., 2007; Singer, 2011; Singer, 2013a).

• **IPCC Claim #4:** Both polar regions should have warmed faster than the rest of Earth during the late twentieth century. Late-twentieth century warming occurred in many Arctic locations and also over a limited area of the West Antarctic Peninsula, but the large polar East Antarctic Ice Sheet has been cooling since at least the 1950s (O’Donnell et al., 2010).

More facts about climate models and their limitations reported in Chapter 1 of CCR-II: Physical Science are reported in Figure 5.

We conclude the current generation of GCMs 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.

---

**FIGURE 3**

**Key Facts about Temperature Forcings and Feedbacks**

- A doubling of CO₂ from pre-industrial levels (from 280 to 560 ppm) would likely produce a temperature forcing of 3.7 Wm⁻² in the lower atmosphere, for about ~1°C of *prima facie* warming.
- IPCC models stress the importance of positive feedback from increasing water vapor and thereby project warming of ~3-6°C, whereas empirical data indicate an order of magnitude less warming of ~0.3-1.0°C.
- In ice core samples, changes in temperature precede parallel changes in atmospheric CO₂ by several hundred years; also, temperature and CO₂ are uncoupled through lengthy portions of the historical and geological records; therefore CO₂ cannot be the primary forcing agent for most temperature changes.
- Atmospheric methane (CH₄) levels for the past two decades fall well below the values projected by the IPCC in its Assessment Reports. The IPCC’s temperature projections incorporate these inflated CH₄ estimates and need downward revision accordingly.
- The melting of permafrost or submarine gas hydrates is not likely to emit dangerous amounts of methane at current rates of warming.
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions are expected to fall as CO₂ concentrations and temperatures rise, indicating it acts as a negative climate feedback.
- Other negative feedbacks on climate sensitivity that are either discounted or underestimated by the IPCC include increases in low-level clouds in response to enhanced atmospheric water vapor, increases in ocean emissions of dimethyl sulfide (DMS), and the presence and total cooling effect of both natural and industrial aerosols.

3. Postulates

Figure 2 identifies five postulates at the base of the IPCC’s claim that global warming is resulting, or will result, from anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. All five are readily refuted by real-world observations.

- **IPCC Postulate #1**: The warming of the twentieth century cannot be explained by natural variability. Temperature records contain natural climate rhythms that are not well summarized or defined by fitting straight lines through arbitrary portions of a fundamentally rhythmic, non-stationary data plot. In particular, linear fitting fails to take account of meteorological-oceanographical-solar variations that are well established to occur at multidecadal and millennial time scales. Even assuming, wrongly, that global temperatures would have been unchanged in the absence of man-made greenhouse gas emissions, the correctness of IPCC’s assertion depends upon the period of time considered (Davis and Bohling, 2001). For example, temperatures have been cooling since 8,000 and 2,000 years ago; warming since 20,000 years ago, and also since 1850 and since 1979; and static (no net warming or cooling) between 700 and 150 AD and since 1997 AD.

Global warming during the twentieth century occurred in two pulses, between 1910–1940 and 1975–2000, at gentle rates of a little over 1.5°C/century (British Meteorological Office, 2013). In contrast, natural warming at some individual meteorological stations during the 1920s proceeded at high rates of up to 4°C/decade or more (Chylek et al., 2004). The first period (1910–1940) represents rates of global warming that are fully natural (having occurred prior to the major build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere), whereas measurements made during the late twentieth century warming are likely exaggerated by inadequate correction for the urban heat island effect.

Comparison of modern and ancient rates of natural temperature change is difficult because of the lack of direct measurements available prior to 1850. However, high-quality proxy temperature records from the Greenland ice core for the past 10,000 years demonstrate a natural range of warming and cooling rates between +2.5 and -2.5 °C/century (Alley, 2000; Carter, 2010, Fig. 7), significantly greater than rates measured for Greenland or the globe during the twentieth century.

- **IPCC Postulate #2**: The late twentieth century warm peak was of greater magnitude than previous natural peaks. The glaciological and recent geological records contain numerous examples of ancient temperatures up to 3°C or more warmer than the peak reported at the end of the twentieth century. During the Holocene, such warmer peaks included the Egyptian, Minoan, Roman, and Medieval warm periods (Alley, 2000). During the Pleistocene, warmer peaks were associated with interglacial oxygen isotope stages 5, 9, 11, and 31 (Listiecki and Raymo, 2005). During the Late Miocene...
and Early Pliocene (6–3 million years ago) temperature consistently attained values 2–3°C above twentieth century values (Zachos et al., 2001).

Figure 6 summarizes these and other findings about surface temperatures that appear in Chapter 4 of CCR-II: Physical Science.
FIGURE 6
Key Facts about Surface Temperature

- Whether today's global surface temperature is seen to be part of a warming trend depends upon the time period considered.
- Over (climatic) time scales of many thousand years, temperature is cooling; over the historical (meteorological) time scale of the past century temperature has warmed. Over the past 16 years, there has been no net warming despite an increase in atmospheric CO₂ of 8% – which represents 34% of all human-related CO₂ emissions released to the atmosphere since the industrial revolution.
- Given an atmospheric mixing time of ~1 year, the facts just related represent a test of the dangerous warming hypothesis, which test it fails.
- Based upon the HadCRUT dataset favored by the IPCC, two phases of warming occurred during the twentieth century, between 1910–1940 and 1979–2000, at similar rates of a little over 1.5°C/century. The early twentieth century warming preceded major industrial carbon dioxide emissions, and must be real; warming during the second (prima facie, similar) period might incorporate a small human-related carbon dioxide effect, but warming might also be inflated by urban heat island effects.
- Other temperature datasets fail to record the late twentieth century warming seen in the HadCRUT dataset (Figure 3).
- There was nothing unusual about either the magnitude or rate of the late twentieth century warming pulses represented on the HadCRUT record, both falling well within the envelope of known, previous natural variations.
- No empirical evidence exists to support the assertion that a planetary warming of 2°C would be net ecologically or economically damaging.


onward, however, higher-resolution sampling has repeatedly shown these historic temperature changes precede the parallel changes in CO₂ by several hundred years or more (Mudelsee, 2001). A similar relationship of temperature change leading CO₂ change (in this case by several months) also characterizes the much shorter seasonal cyclicity manifest in Hawaiian and other meteorological measurements (Kuo et al., 1990). In such circumstances, changing levels of CO₂ cannot be driving changes in temperature, but must either be themselves stimulated by temperature change, or be co-varying with temperature in response to changes in another (at this stage unknown) variable.

- IPCC Postulate #4: Solar forcings are too small to explain twentieth century warming. IPCC authors have concluded solar forcing alone is inadequate to account for twentieth century warming, inferring CO₂ must be responsible for the remainder. Nonetheless, observations indicate variations occur in total ocean–atmospheric meridional heat transport and that these variations are driven by changes in solar radiation rooted in the intrinsic variability of the Sun’s magnetic activity (Soon and Legates, 2013).

Incoming solar radiation is most often expressed as Total Solar Insolation (TSI), a measure derived from multi-proxy measures of solar activity (Hoyt and Schatten, 1993; extended and re-scaled by Willson, 2011; Scafetta and Willson, 2013). The newest estimates, from satellite-borne ACRIM-3 measurements, indicate TSI ranged between 1360 and 1363 Wm⁻² between 1979 and 2011, the variability of ~3 Wm⁻² occurring in parallel with the 11-year sunspot cycle. Larger changes in TSI are also known to occur in parallel with climatic change over longer time scales. For instance, Shapiro et al. (2011) estimated the TSI change between the Maunder Minimum and current conditions may have been as large as 6 Wm⁻².

Temperature records from circum-Arctic regions of the Northern Hemisphere show a close correlation with TSI over the past 150 years, with both measures conforming to the ~60–70 year multidecadal cycle. In contrast, the measured steady rise of CO₂ emissions over the same period shows little correlation with the strong multidecadal (and shorter) ups and downs of surface temperature around the world.

Finally, the IPCC ignores x-ray, ultraviolet, and magnetic flux variation, the latter having particularly important implications for the modulation of galactic cosmic ray influx and low cloud formation (Svensmark, 1988; Kirkby, et al., 2011). Figure 7 summarizes these and other findings about solar forcings from Chapter 3 of CCR-II: Physical Science.

- IPCC Postulate #5: Warming of 2°C above today’s temperature would be harmful. The suggestion that 2°C
Multiple lines of evidence suggest a 2°C rise in temperature would not be harmful to the biosphere. The period termed the Holocene Climatic Optimum (c. 8,000 ybp) was 2–3°C warmer than today (Alley, 2000), and the planet attained similar temperatures for several million years during the Miocene and Pliocene (Zachos et al., 2001). Biodiversity is encouraged by warmer rather than colder temperatures (Idso and Idso, 2009), and higher temperatures and elevated CO₂ greatly stimulate the growth of most plants (Idso and Idso, 2011).

Despite its widespread adoption by environmental NGOs, lobbyists, and governments, no empirical evidence exists to substantiate the claim that 2°C of warming presents a threat to planetary ecologies or environments. Nor can any convincing case be made that a warming will be more economically costly than an equivalent cooling (either of which could occur unheralded for entirely natural reasons), since any planetary change of 2°C magnitude in temperature would result in complex local and regional changes, some being of economic or environmental benefit and others being harmful.

We conclude neither the rate nor the magnitude of the reported late twentieth century surface warming (1979–2000) lay outside normal natural variability, nor was it in any way unusual compared to earlier episodes in Earth’s climatic history. Furthermore, solar forcings of temperature change are likely more important than is currently recognized, and evidence is lacking that a 2°C increase in temperature (of whatever cause) would be globally harmful.

4. Circumstantial Evidence

As its third line of reasoning, the IPCC presents circumstantial evidence regarding natural phenomena known to vary with temperature. The examples the IPCC chooses to report invariably point to a negative impact on plant and animal life and human well-being. When claims are made that such phenomena are the result of anthropogenic global warming, almost invariably at least one of the following three requirements of scientific confidence are lacking:

(1) Correlation does not establish causation. Correlation of, say, a declining number of polar bears and a rising temperature does not establish causation between one and the other, for it is not at all unusual for two things to covary in parallel with other forcing factors.
(2) Control for natural variability. We live on a dynamic planet in which all aspects of the physical and biological environment are in a constant state of flux for reasons that are entirely natural (including, of course, temperature change). It is wrong to assume no changes would occur in the absence of the human presence. Climate, for example, will be different in 100 years regardless of what humans do or don’t do.

(3) Local temperature records that confirm warming. Many studies of the impact of climate change on wildlife simply assume temperatures have risen, extreme weather events are more frequent, etc., without establishing that the relevant local temperature records conform to the postulated simple long-term warming trend.

All five of the IPCC’s claims relying on circumstantial evidence listed in Figure 2 are refutable.

- **IPCC Claim #1: Unusual melting is occurring in mountain glaciers, Arctic sea ice and polar icecaps.** What melting is occurring in mountain glaciers, Arctic sea ice and polar icecaps is not occurring at “unnatural” rates and does not constitute evidence of a human impact on the climate. Both the Greenland (Johannessen et al., 2005; Zwally et al., 2005) and Antarctic (Zwally and Giovinetto, 2011) icecaps are close to balance. The global area of sea ice today is similar to that first measured by satellite observation in 1979 (Humlum, 2013) and significantly exceeds the ice cover present in former, warmer times.

  Valley glaciers wax and wane on multidecadal, centennial, and millennial time-scales, and no evidence exists that their present, varied behavior falls outside long-term norms or is related to human-related CO₂ emissions (Easterbrook, 2011). Figure 8 summarizes the findings of Chapter 5 of CCR-II: Physical Science regarding glaciers, sea ice, and polar icecaps.

- **IPCC Claim #2: Global sea level is rising at an enhanced rate and swamping tropical coral atolls.** Sea-level rise is not accelerating (Houston and Dean, 2011). The global average sea-level continues to increase at its long-term rate of 1–2 mm/year globally (Wöppelmann et al., 2009). Local and regional sea levels continue to exhibit typical natural variability – in some places rising and in others falling. Unusual sea-level rise is therefore not drowning Pacific coral islands, nor are the islands being abandoned by “climate refugees.”

  The best available data show dynamic variations in Pacific sea level vary in accord with El Niño-La Niña cycles, superimposed on a natural long-term eustatic rise (Australian Bureau of Meteorology, 2011). Island coastal flooding results not from sea level rise, but from spring tides or storm surges in combination with development pressures such as borrow pit digging or groundwater withdrawal. Persons emigrating from the islands are doing so for social and economic reasons rather than in response
to environmental threat.

Another claim concerning the effect of climate change on oceans is that increases in freshwater runoff into the oceans will disrupt the global thermohaline circulation system. But the range of natural fluctuation in the global ocean circulation system has yet to be fully delineated (Srokosz et al., 2012). Research to date shows no evidence for changes that lie outside previous natural variability, nor for any malign influence from increases in human-related CO₂ emissions. See Figure 9 for more findings about climate change and oceans from Chapter 6 of CCR-II: Physical Science.

- IPCC Claim #3: Droughts, floods, and monsoon variability and intensity are increasing. The link between warming and drought is weak, and pan evaporation (a measurement that responds to the effects of several climate elements) decreased over the twentieth century (Roderick et al., 2009). Huntington (2008) concluded on a globally averaged basis precipitation over land increased by about 2% over the period 1900–1998. However, changes in the hydrosphere of this type are regionally highly variable and show a closer correlation with multidecadal climate rhythmicity than they do with global temperature (Zanchettin et al., 2008).

Monsoon intensity correlates with variations in solar activity rather than increases in atmospheric CO₂, and both the South American and Asian monsoons became more active during the cold Little Ice Age and less active during the Medieval Warm Period (Vuille et al., 2012), suggesting there would be less volatility if the world becomes warmer. See Figure 9 for more facts about monsoons, droughts, and floods presented in Chapter 6 of CCR-I: Physical Science.

- IPCC Claim #4: Global warming is leading to more, or more intense, wildfires, rainfall, storms, hurricanes, and other extreme weather events. One of the few areas where the IPCC has distanced itself from the popular but false claims made by many environmentalists and politicians relates to extreme weather events. In 2012, an IPCC report acknowledged that a relationship between global warming and wildfires, rainfall, storms, hurricanes, and other extreme weather events has not been demonstrated (IPCC, 2012). The NIPCC team’s analysis agrees. In no case has a convincing relationship been established between warming over the past 100 years and increases in any of these extreme events. Instead, the number and intensity of extreme events vary, and they wax and wane from one place to another and often in

**FIGURE 9**

**Key Facts about the Hydrosphere**

**Oceans**

- Knowledge of local sea-level change is vital for coastal management; such change occurs at widely variable rates around the world, typically between about +5 and -5 mm/year.
- Global (eustatic) sea level, knowledge of which has only limited use for coastal management, rose at an average rate of between 1 and 2 mm/year over the past century.
- Satellite altimeter studies of sea-level change indicate rates of global rise since 1993 of over 3 mm/year, but complexities of processing and the infancy of the method precludes viewing this result as secure.
- Rates of global sea-level change vary in decadal and multidecadal ways and show neither recent acceleration nor any simple relationship with increasing CO₂ emissions.
- Pacific coral atolls are not being drowned by extra sea-level rise; rather, atoll shorelines are affected by direct weather and infrequent high tide events, ENSO sea level variations, and impacts of increasing human populations.
- Extra sea-level rise due to heat expansion (thermosteric rise) is also unlikely given that the Argo buoy network shows no significant ocean warming over the past 8 years (Knox and Douglass, 2010).
- Though the range of natural variation has yet to be fully described, evidence is lacking for any recent changes in global ocean circulation that lie outside natural variation or were forced by human CO₂ emissions.

**Monsoons, Droughts, and Floods**

- Little evidence exists for an overall increase in global precipitation during the twentieth century independent of natural multidecadal climate rhythmicity.
- Monsoon precipitation did not become more variable or intense during late twentieth century warming; instead, precipitation responded mostly to variations in solar activity.
- South American and Asian monsoons were more active during the cold Little Ice Age and less active during the Medieval Warm Period. Neither global nor local changes in streamflow have been linked to CO₂ emissions. The relationship between drought and global warming is weak, since severe droughts occurred during both the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age.

*Source:“Chapter 6. Observations: The Hydrosphere,” Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science (Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2013).*
parallel with natural decadal or multidecadal climate oscillations. Figure 10 summarizes key facts on this subject presented in Chapter 7 of CCR-II: Physical Science.

- **IPCC Claim #5:** Unusual melting of Boreal permafrost or sub-seabed gas hydrates is causing warming due to methane release. Over historic time, methane concentration has increased from about 700 ppb in the eighteenth century to the current level of near 1,800 ppb. The increase in methane concentration levelled off between 1998 and 2006 at around 1,750 ppb, which may reflect measures taken at that time to stem leakage from wells, pipelines, and distribution facilities (Quirk, 2010). More recently, since about 2007, methane concentrations have started to increase again, possibly due to a combination of leaks from new shale gas drilling and Arctic permafrost decline.

The contribution of increased methane to radiation forcing since the eighteenth century is estimated to be only 0.7 Wm⁻², which is small. And in any case, no evidence exists that current changes in Arctic permafrost are other than natural. Most of Earth’s gas hydrates occur at low saturations and in sediments at such great depths below the seafloor or onshore permafrost that they will barely be affected by warming over even one thousand years.

We conclude no unambiguous evidence exists for adverse changes to the global environment caused by human-related CO₂ emissions. In particular, the cryosphere is not melting at an enhanced rate; sea-level rise is not accelerating; no systematic changes have been documented in evaporation or rainfall or in the magnitude or intensity of extreme meteorological events; and an increased release of methane into the atmosphere from permafrost or sub-seabed gas hydrates is unlikely.

5. Policy Recommendations

The Green Team–Red Team strategy outlined in the introduction presumes the existence of decision-makers in industry and government who make sensible policy decisions in light of the best-available research. Therefore, while a useful way to discover and expose all sides of an argument, a two-team strategy is not usually enough on its own to resolve an issue.

To date, most government signatories to the UN’s Framework Convention on Climate Change have deferred to the monopoly advice of the IPCC in setting their national climate change policies. More than 20 years down the track, it is now evident this approach has been mistaken. One result has been the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars implementing energy policies that now appear to have been unnecessary, or at least ill-timed and ineffective.

The scientific findings of the NIPCC team point toward several policy recommendations quite different from those that have come from the IPCC and its related
Summary for Policymakers

agencies, bureaus, and commissions at the United Nations. We make the following recommendations:

- Climate-hazard response plans should take into account long-term trends, but the benefits should be suitably discounted and investments delayed until action is necessary and likely to be cost-effective. The risks created by longer-term climate change occur over periods of decades to hundreds or thousands of years. Urgent action to “stop global warming” is not needed, and in fact will almost certainly be wasteful or damaging to civil and economic liberties.

- Rather than rely exclusively on the IPCC for scientific advice, policymakers should seek out advice from independent, nongovernment organizations and scientists who are free of financial and political conflicts of interest. The Chinese Academy of Sciences took an important step in this direction by translating and publishing an abridged edition of the first two volumes in NIPCC’s Climate Change Reconsidered series.

- Climate change, whether man-made or not, is a global phenomenon with very different effects on different parts of the world. Individual nations should take charge of setting their own climate policies based upon the hazards that apply to their particular geography, geology, weather, and culture – as India has started to do by setting up an advisory Indian Network on Comprehensive Climate Change Assessment (INCCCA) (Nelson, 2010).

- Recognize the theoretical hazard of dangerous human-caused global warming is but one small part of a much wider climate hazard – the extreme natural weather and climatic events that Nature intermittently presents us with, and always will (Carter, 2010). The 2005 Hurricane Katrina disaster in the U.S., the 2007 floods in the United Kingdom, and the tragic bushfires in Australia in 2009 demonstrate the governments of even advanced, wealthy countries are often inadequately prepared for climate-related disasters of natural origin.

- Climate change as a natural hazard is as much a geological as it is a meteorological issue. Geological hazards are mostly dealt with by providing civil defense authorities and the public with accurate, evidence-based information regarding events such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, tsunamis, storms, and floods (which represent climatic as well as weather events), and then planning to mitigate and adapt to the effects when such events occur.

The idea that there can be a one-size-fits-all global solution to address future climate change, such as recommended by the United Nations, fails to deal with real climate and climate-related hazards. It also turned climate change into a political issue long before the science was sufficiently advanced to inform policymakers. A better path forward was suggested by Ronald Brunner and Amanda Lynch:

We need to use adaptive governance to produce response programs that cope with hazardous climate events as they happen, and that encourage diversity and innovation in the search for solutions. In such a fashion, the highly contentious “global warming” problem can be recast into an issue in which every culture and community around the world has an inherent interest (Brunner and Lynch, 2010).

Conclusion

Few scientists deny that human activities can have an effect on local climate or that the sum of such local effects could hypothetically rise to the level of an observable global signal. The key questions to be answered, however, are whether the human global signal is large enough to be measured and if it is, does it represent, or is it likely to become, a dangerous change outside the range of natural variability?

NIPCC’s conclusion, drawn from its extensive review of the scientific evidence, is that any human global climate signal is so small as to be embedded within the background variability of the natural climate system and is not dangerous. At the same time, global temperature change is occurring, as it always naturally does. A phase of temperature stasis or cooling has succeeded the mild twentieth century warming. It is certain that similar natural climate changes will continue to occur.

In the face of such facts, the most prudent climate policy is to prepare for and adapt to extreme climate events and changes regardless of their origin. Adaptive planning for future hazardous climate events and change should be tailored to provide responses to the known rates, magnitudes, and risks of natural change. Once in place, these same plans will provide an adequate response to any human-caused change that may or may not emerge.

Policymakers should resist pressure from lobby groups to silence scientists who question the authority of the IPCC to claim to speak for “climate science.” Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science reveals a scientific community deeply uncertain about the reliability of the IPCC’s computer models, its postulates,
and its interpretation of circumstantial evidence. This criticism doesn’t come from a “fringe” of the climate science community: It is stated plainly and repeated in thousands of articles in the peer-reviewed literature.

The distinguished British biologist Conrad Waddington wrote in 1941,

It is ... important that scientists must be ready for their pet theories to turn out to be wrong. Science as a whole certainly cannot allow its judgment about facts to be distorted by ideas of what ought to be true, or what one may hope to be true (Waddington, 1941).

This prescient statement merits careful examination by those who continue to assert the fashionable belief, in the face of strong empirical evidence to the contrary, that human CO₂ emissions are going to cause dangerous global warming.
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Reviews of *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science*

"I fully support the efforts of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) and publication of its latest report, *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science*, to help the general public to understand the reality of global climate change."

**Kumar Raina**  
Former Deputy Director General  
Geological Survey of India

"I was glad to see that a new report was coming from the NIPCC. The work of this group of scientists to present the evidence for natural climate warming and climate change is an essential counter-balance to the biased reporting of the IPCC. They have brought to focus a range of peer-reviewed publications showing that natural forces have in the past and continue today to dominate the climate signal. Considering the recent evidence that climate models have failed to predict the flattening of the global temperature curve, and that global warming seems to have ended some 15 years ago, the work of the NIPCC is particularly important."

**Ian Clark**  
Department of Earth Sciences  
University of Ottawa, Canada

"The CCR-II report correctly explains that most of the reports on global warming and its impacts on sea-level rise, ice melts, glacial retreats, impact on crop production, extreme weather events, rainfall changes, etc. have not properly considered factors such as physical impacts of human activities, natural variability in climate, lopsided models used in the prediction of production estimates, etc. There is a need to look into these phenomena at local and regional scales before sensationalization of global warming-related studies."

**S. Jeewananda Reddy**  
Former Chief Technical Advisor  
United Nations World Meteorological Organization

"NIPCC’s CCR-II report should open the eyes of world leaders who have fallen prey to the scandalous climate dictates by the IPCC. People are already suffering the consequences of sub-prime financial instruments. Let them not suffer more from IPCC’s sub-prime climate science and models. That is the stark message of the NIPCC’s CCR-II report."

**M. I. Bhat**  
Formerly Professor and Head  
Department of Geology and Geophysics  
University of Kashmir

"The claim by the UN IPCC that ‘global sea level is rising at an enhanced rate and swamping tropical coral atolls’ does NOT agree with observational facts, and must hence be discarded as a serious disinformation. This is well taken in the CCR-II report."

**Nils-Axel Mörner**  
Emeritus Professor of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics,  
Stockholm University, Sweden

"Library shelves are cluttered with books on global warming. The problem is identifying which ones are worth reading. The NIPCC’s CCR-II report is one of these. Its coverage of the topic is comprehensive without being superficial. It sorts through conflicting claims made by scientists and highlights mounting evidence that climate sensitivity to carbon dioxide increase is lower than climate models have until now assumed."

**Chris de Freitas**  
School of Environment  
The University of Auckland, New Zealand

"*Climate Change Reconsidered* is simply the most comprehensive documentation of the case against climate alarmism ever produced. Basing policy on the scientifically incomplete and internally inconsistent reports of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is no longer controversial – *Climate Change Reconsidered* shows that it is absolutely foolhardy, and anyone doing so is risking humiliation. It is a must-read for anyone who is accountable to the public, and it needs to be taken very, very seriously."

**Patrick J. Michaels**  
Director, Center for the Study of Science  
Cato Institute
"CCR-II provides scientists, policy makers and other interested parties information related to the current state of knowledge in atmospheric studies. Rather than coming from a pre-determined politicized position that is typical of the IPCC, the NIPCC constrains itself to the scientific process so as to provide objective information. If we (scientists) are honest, we understand that the study of atmospheric processes/dynamics is in its infancy. Consequently, the work of the NIPCC and its most recent report is very important. It is time to move away from politicized science back to science – this is what NIPCC is demonstrating by example."

Bruce Borders
Professor of Forest Biometrics
Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources
University of Georgia

"The NIPCC’s new report, *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science*, fires a scientific cannon shot across the bow of the quasi-religious human-caused global warming movement by presenting data, facts, and scientific method constructs of climate change science. I only wish the IPCC would become as objective. A recent column by a nationally recognized writer recalled Syria outlawing yo-yos in 1933 because they thought that yo-yo motion caused drought. The NIPCC report documents that the AGW movement has created its own yo-yo rather than shedding light on how Earth dynamic systems change with time. I applaud the NIPCC for bringing the scientific method back into what should always have been a scientific debate.

Lee C. Gerhard
Senior Scientist Emeritus, University of Kansas
Past Director and State Geologist
Kansas Geological Survey

"I support [the work of the NIPCC] because I am convinced that the whole field of climate and climate change urgently needs an open debate between several ‘schools of thought,’ in science and well as other disciplines, many of which jumped on the IPCC bandwagon far too readily. Climate, and even more so impacts and responses, are far too complex and important to be left to an official body like the IPCC."

Sonja A.Boehmer-Christiansen
Reader Emeritus, Department of Geography
Hull University
Editor, *Energy&Environment*

"The NIPCC report *Climate Change Reconsidered II* is a crucial document to get science right: Billions of $s$ are being spent in research based on the assumption that human emissions of CO₂ drive dangerous climate change. Contemplating relevant peer-reviewed scientific literature, the CCR-II shows us why this basic assumption is wrong, turning irrelevant for society the results of a considerable part of the costly research carried out by the ‘consensus scientific community’ endorsing IPCC climate alarmism."

Albrecht Glatzel
Agro-Biologist
Retired Director of Research, INTTAS
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Comments to the Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup
October 16, 2013

The Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup is interested in hearing public views on approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

Comments and suggestions (please write legibly):

Please see the attached correspondence and materials for my comments and suggestions. I will provide the packet if and when I am speaking, if I am selected to speak.

Esther Larsen

**Please continue on back or attach pages if needed**

Optional Information:

Name: Esther Larsen

Organization: Self

Please turn this sheet into one of the comment boxes before leaving the Public Hearing. If you have additional comments after the meeting, please submit by email at: climateworkgroup@ecy.wa.gov.

The deadline for submitting comments is October 30, 2013.

*Please note any information provided on this sheet is public information and may be posted online.*
To: Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup, Olympia, WA

From: Esther Larsen, P.O. Box 18971, Spokane, WA 99228-0971

Date: October 16, 2013

Re: Climate Workgroup Hearing, Spokane, WA

Good Evening, Governor Inslee, Senator Ericksen, Senator Rankor, Representative Fitzgibbon, Representative Short and staff. and Senator Cleveland.

My name is Esther Larsen, and my mailing address is P.O. Box 18971, Spokane, Washington, 99228-0971. I reside in the 6th Legislative District near Whitworth University in the unincorporated area of Spokane County. I am by profession an attorney and a community planner. I am a member of the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association and have been for nearly 10 years the Co-Chair of the Chapter's Legislative Committee. I am speaking to you this evening as an individual to provide testimony and information regarding how climate change has and continues to impact my community and me and specifically comments on:

- The Workgroup process;
- Specific actions and policies I want to see implemented to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State; and
- Specific actions and policies that I do not want to see implemented to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State.

The Workgroup process with a variety of options for public input is greatly appreciated. Two minutes go past quickly; however, the online comment and other written options are available. Thank you for public participation; is it the base upon which democracy in action is built. Without the voice of the citizens, we have no community.

I have a packet of materials for the Climate Workgroup and will point out a few items that I would suggest as actions and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State. The packet includes materials from the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association:

- 2010/2011 Annual Report – the 2012/2013 Report is in final review, and I will provide a copy to the Climate Workgroup;
- "Planning for Climate Change" – Executive Summary; and
- Sustainable Washington page from the website of the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association.
I would like to see these actions and policies adopted by Washington State:

- Require greenhouse gas emission reduction goals to be adopted as part of local, regional and state transportation plans and ensure consistency between regional goals and local goals in local comprehensive plan certification processes;
- Expand planning horizons to include longer (50 plus-year) plan horizons rather than only short (one to five-year) and medium (20-year) plan horizons;
- Reuse water by encouraging reuse and eliminating barriers to using rainwater, gray water and wastewater on-site for non-potable water needs;
- Create incentive programs that foster in-fill in existing districts over new development on greenfield sites;
- Establish impact fees that encompass the true costs of extending infrastructure to greenfield sites;
- Provide planning support for farmland preservation;
- Plan for affordable housing near transit;
- Minimize heat impacts through design;
- Promote district or neighborhood scale efficiencies with code provisions and incentives for neighborhood scale improvements that capture green building benefits such as infill development, cottage housing, district heating and cooling, distributed generated grids, and pedestrian-friendly mixed-use communities; and
- Other items that are outlined in the packet of materials attached to this correspondence.

Actions and policies that do not contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and which I would like to see eliminated include past and still continuing practices and policies such as: subsidizing with public funds our transportation systems prioritizing single-occupant vehicles rather than transit and non-greenhouse gas emitting modes of transportation; development of a built environment without planning for the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; conversion of natural resources lands; elimination of natural resources; and destruction of critical areas.

I have three sons, three daughters-in-law and five grandchildren. I would like for them to have the opportunity to live without the destructive forces that climate change has and continues to bring to Washington State. Thank you for your efforts regarding this issue, and please do read the publications of the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association including the hundreds of actions and policies that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Sincerely,

Esther Larsen