

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/6/2018 12:00:00 AM

First name: Anonymous

Last name: Anonymous

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Climate models overestimate the response of temperature to greenhouse gas increases. Also shown was a lack of evidence to blame humans for an increase in extreme events. One cannot convict CO₂ of causing any of these events, because they've happened in the past before CO₂ levels rose. Even so, using these climate model simulations we can calculate that the theoretical impact of legislative actions being considered on the global temperature is essentially imperceptible (Christy JR, House Ways and Means Testimony, 25 Feb 2009). In such calculations we simply run the model with and without the proposed changes in greenhouse gases to see the difference in the models' climates. The result is that actions will not produce a measurable climate effect that can be attributable or predictable with any level of confidence, especially at the regional level. With the most recent estimates of low climate sensitivity, the impact of these emission-control measures will be even tinier since the climate system doesn't seem to be very sensitive to CO₂ emissions. The recent switch to natural gas represents a partial move to decarbonize our energy production since methane has four hydrogen atoms for every one carbon atom. The U.S. produces 29 percent of the world's goods and emits only 18 percent of the world's CO₂ emissions (EIA 2009 values.) In other words, the U.S. ranks rather well considering the energy intensive industries of farming, manufacturing, mining, metals processing, etc. that are performed here, the goods of which are sold to the world. So, we produce quite a bit relative to our emissions - the kind of products and services that the world wants to buy. With the recent shift to more natural gas, the U.S. efficiency continues to rise. When thinking about policy regarding CO₂, one cannot ignore the immense benefits produced directly by CO₂ or indirectly from its relationship to low-cost energy. It is a simple fact that CO₂ is plant food and the world around us evolved when levels of CO₂ were five to ten times what they are today. Our green world is a consequence of atmospheric CO₂. And, food for plants means food for people. The extra CO₂ we are putting into the atmosphere not only invigorates the biosphere, but also enhances the yields of our food crops. This is a tremendous benefit to nature and us. A rising CO₂ concentration is also an indicator of human progress in health, welfare and security provided by affordable carbon-based energy. As someone who has lived in a developing country, without energy, life is brutal and short. At present, hundreds of millions of people are dependent on low-grade biomass (tree branches, dung, etc.) for energy. These sources place a huge burden, literally, on people to find, cut and carry the material where needed. Landscapes are deforested and waterways contaminated by these activities. And tragically, the U.N. estimates about 2 million children die each year due to diseases fostered by the toxic fumes produced when burning wood and dung in the homes. Higher density sources of fuel such as coal and natural gas utilized in centrally-produced power stations actually improve the environmental footprint of the poorest nations while at the same time lifting people from the scourge of poverty. Developing countries in Asia already burn more than twice the coal that North America does, and that discrepancy will continue to expand. The fact our legislative actions will be inconsequential in the grand scheme of things can be seen by noting that these actions attempt to bend the blue curve for North America down a little, and that's all. So, downward adjustments to North American coal use will have virtually no effect on global CO₂ emissions (or the climate), no matter how sensitive one thinks the climate system might be to the extra CO₂ we are putting back into the atmosphere. If the country deems it necessary to de-carbonize civilization's main energy sources, then compelling reasons beyond human-induced climate change need to be offered that must address, for example, ways to help poor countries develop affordable energy. Climate change alone is a weak leg on which to stand to justify a centrally planned, massive change in energy production, infrastructure and cost.