Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/9/2018 12:00:00 AM
First name: Anonymous
Last name: Anonymous
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Extreme events are poor metrics to use for detecting climate change. Indeed, because of their rarity (by definition) using extreme events to bolster a claim about any type of climate change (warming or cooling) runs the risk of setting up the classic "non-falsifiable hypothesis." For example, we were told by the IPCC that "milder winter temperatures will decrease heavy snowstorms". After the winters of 2009-10 and 2010-11, we are told the opposite by advocates of the IPCC position, "Climate Change Makes Major Snowstorms More Likely" The non-falsifiable hypotheses can be stated this way, "whatever happens is consistent with my hypothesis." In other words, there is no event that would "falsify" the hypothesis. As such, these assertions cannot be considered science or in anyway informative since the hypothesis' fundamental prediction is "anything may happen." In the example above if winters become milder or they become snowier, the non-falsifiable hypothesis stands. This is not science.when the enterprising individual observes an unusual weather event, it may be tempting to define it as a once-for-all extreme metric to "prove" a point about climate change - even if the event was measured at a station with only 30 years of record. This works both ways with extremes. If one were prescient enough to have predicted in 1996 that over the next 15 years, five states would break all-time record cold temperatures while none would break record high temperatures as evidence for cooling, would that prove CO2 emissions have no impact on climate? Number of extreme events happen, and their causes are intricately tied to the semi-unstable dynamical situations that can occur out of an environment of natural, unforced variability.Science checks hypotheses (assertions) by testing specific, falsifiable predictions implied by those hypotheses. The predictions are to be made in a manner that, as much as possible, is blind to the data against which they are evaluated. It is the testable predictions from hypotheses, derived from climate model output, that run into trouble. Before going on to that test, the main point here is that extreme events do not lend themselves as being rigorous metrics for convicting human CO2 emissions of being guilty of causing them.A project which seeks to generate consistent and systematic weather maps back to 1871 (20th Century Reanalyisis Project, http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/20thC_Rean/) has taken a look at the three major indices which are often related to extreme events. None of the three major indices of climate variability that we used show a trend of increased circulation going back to 1871." (The three indices were the Pacific Walker Circulation, the North Atlantic Oscillation and the Pacific-North America Oscillation, Compo et al. 2011.) In other words, there appears to be no supporting evidence over this period that human factors have influenced the major circulation patterns which drive the larger-scale extreme events. Again all science point to natural, unforced variability of Mother Nature. as the dominant feature of events that have transpired in the past 130 years.The conterminous U.S. covers only 1.8 percent of the globe so all the regulations against American businesses and tax payers will only produce 1.8 % difference if all the fake reports were true. This is crazy math of environmental activist and Billionaires to harm American poor..