

26 June 2014

There was a pervasive theme throughout the entire presentation/proposal last evening, namely that CO2 is leading inexorably, and directly, to a climate catastrophe. But it is never stated in the document. Is this because the OEP wants it to be accepted, but is worried that it's scientific underpinning is weak and debatable? I believe it either should be stated, or an alternative statement like "While there is evidence to support the theory that increasing CO2 will raise global temperatures significantly, and hence lead to many environmental problems, the extent of any temperature increase is a subject of substantial debate within the meteorological community" should be inserted.

A couple of years ago there was a governor's committee which spent dozens of hours coming up with proposals to "solve" the global warming problem. But in its final report, it didn't dare mention how its various recommendations would contribute to solving this "warming" problem, even if implemented completely. Instead, it kicked the can down the road, put CO2 numbers in place of temperature numbers. No one disagrees that the concentration of CO2 is rising, the disagreement is over how much, if any, increases in CO2 will increase global temperatures!. Do you plan to kick the can down the road too? The draft report is very unclear on this point.

There are other troubling issues, namely ZEV and LEV automobiles. I am unaware of the contribution to the rising CO2 levels that a switch to electric cars will "solve". Either state the evidence and the numbers, or delete any reference to electric cars.

Finally, there are no cautionary comments about the negligible effect anything New Hampshire, or the US, could do if it reduced its CO2 emissions to zero. Is this omission a concession to the fuzzies also?

Fred Ward