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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

Matthew Carter, the committee's staff director and a former PSC chairman, emphasized what the bill did not contain: "no rate increase for ratepayers."

"Energy efficiency is always cheaper than a new plant ... even the cheapest power plant," [Susan Glickman] told legislators. But Florida's PSC last year "threw out the conservation goals for half the state" rather than require companies to capitalize on energy efficiency programs as regulators do in 17 other states. SACE, the clean energy advocacy group, is suing the PSC for that decision, alleging it has violated state law.

The Senate bill "is a small step in the right direction," Glickman said, but added, "Florida is definitely behind other states under most measures and will remain so."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

A Senate committee revived the stalled debate over renewable energy in Florida on Monday and moved forward with a bill to give $16 million a year in tax incentives to businesses and homeowners, beginning next year.

The measure, being pushed by Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam, was introduced by the Senate Communications, Energy and Utilities Committee on Monday and will be voted on next week.

It was described by energy advocates as a small step toward encouraging a market for renewable energy in Florida and weaning the state off its dependence on natural gas.

The bill, SB 7202, would allow large companies, such as Walmart and Publix, as well as individual homeowners, to get sales tax breaks and tax credits if they invest in renewable energy machines, products and technology.

Renewable energy includes everything from solar panels to biofuels, wind farms and tidal power. Last year, legislators allowed a series of similar tax credits to expire.

The Senate bill also allows companies to install electric car charging stations without having to be regulated like a utility company.

It includes algae among the list of authorized biofuels. It also requires the state's utility board, the Public Service Commission, to require that electric utility companies be judged on their fuel diversity when they seek approval for new power plants.

Florida utilities rely on natural gas to generate more than half of the state's electricity, a fuel that is dependent on foreign sources and transportation to bring to the state.

Proponents of renewable energy have argued for years that the state should encourage the domestic production of alternative fuels with incentives that jump-start competition.

Matthew Carter, the committee's staff director and a former PSC chairman, emphasized what the bill did not contain: "no rate increase for ratepayers."

For the past three years, the state's largest utilities used the renewable energy debate to push for a bill that would allow them to raise rates on customers so they could develop solar farms. Year after year, the measure stalled.

This year, Putnam has proposed the state's large utilities get automatic approval to raise rates so they can develop up to 75 megawatts a year in renewable energy, but the Senate has not yet included that provision in the bill.

Susan Glickman of the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy disagreed with Carter that the bill will not raise costs to customers.

She said that if legislators fail to include stricter energy efficiency requirements, and allow the PSC to maintain the status quo, customer bills will automatically rise.

Under current law, the PSC is allowed to pass on the fuel costs to customers each year as well as pass along the cost of planning for projected nuclear power plants.

"Energy efficiency is always cheaper than a new plant ... even the cheapest power plant," Glickman told legislators. But Florida's PSC last year "threw out the conservation goals for half the state" rather than require companies to capitalize on energy efficiency programs as regulators do in 17 other states. SACE, the clean energy advocacy group, is suing the PSC for that decision, alleging it has violated state law.

The Senate bill "is a small step in the right direction," Glickman said, but added, "Florida is definitely behind other states under most measures and will remain so."
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

"Will strengthen baseline climate observations and climate data records to ensure that there are long-term and accurate climate records. He will not use climate change research data for political objectives."

During the 2008 presidential campaign, Barack Obama promised to "strengthen baseline climate observations and climate data records to ensure that there are long-term and accurate climate records. He will not use climate change research data for political objectives."

"The mission of NOAA's Climate Data Record Program is to develop and implement a robust, sustainable and scientifically defensible approach to producing and preserving climate records from satellite data," according to the office"s website. The data incorporates information compiled by NOAA for more than 30 years.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Improve climate change data records

"Will strengthen baseline climate observations and climate data records to ensure that there are long-term and accurate climate records. He will not use climate change research data for political objectives."

Sources: "Obama: Advancing the Frontiers of Space Exploration"

Subjects: Environment, Science, Space

\* \* \*

THE OBAMETER: PROMISE KEPT

During the 2008 presidential campaign, Barack Obama promised to "strengthen baseline climate observations and climate data records to ensure that there are long-term and accurate climate records. He will not use climate change research data for political objectives."

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration launched a Satellite Climate Data Record Program in 2009, using funds from the stimulus bill.

"The mission of NOAA's Climate Data Record Program is to develop and implement a robust, sustainable and scientifically defensible approach to producing and preserving climate records from satellite data," according to the office"s website. The data incorporates information compiled by NOAA for more than 30 years.

"These data comprise the longest record of global satellite mapping measurements in the world, and are complemented by data from other sources including NASA and Department of Defense satellites as well as foreign satellites," the office says.

Under the program, a total of 18 grants have been awarded to private industry, universities and government agencies.

Among the information being collected and organized is the fraction of sunlight bouncing off Earth and back into space; energy emitted from clouds, oceans or land; energy emitted from atmospheric water vapor; particulates in the atmosphere; temperatures at various atmospheric layers; ocean surface temperatures; and the extent of sea ice at the poles.

The government has also worked with the World Meteorological Organization and the Committee on Earth Observing Satellites to collaborate on climate data records internationally.

We rate this a Promise Kept.

Sources:

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Climate Data Record Program website, accessed Mar. 12, 2012

\* \* \*

Stimulus money goes to climate change data

Updated: Wednesday, April 8th, 2009

By Angie Drobnic Holan

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration received $830 million from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and the agency plans to use $170 million of that to improve climate research.

NOAA said the money would go to two high-performance computing systems in separate locations to improve the accuracy of seasonal climate and global climate change assessments. The two sites will be selected by a competitive process and create jobs in manufacturing, construction and software engineering, the agency said.

"These proposed funds will put thousands of Americans to work while restoring our coasts and combating climate change," Commerce Secretary Gary Locke said.

President Barack Obama said he would improve climate change data records. Stimulus money is being spent on that goal. We rate this In the Works.

Sources:

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA Submits Proposed Recovery Plan to Congress to Help Create Jobs, Improve Coastal Communities and Protect Habitat , April 7, 2009
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On whether humans contribute to global warming

Mitt Romney on Thursday, October 27th, 2011 in various statements

\* \* \*

THE RULING: HALF FLIP

Do humans contribute to global warming? There's been a robust debate over whether Mitt Romney has flip-flopped on this question. In this item, we'll try to determine whether he has.

We'll start by noting that the Flip-O-Meter rates politicians' consistency on particular topics from No Flip to Full Flop. The meter is not intended to pass judgment on their decisions to change their minds. It's simply gauging whether they did.

Romney's campaign website is silent on climate change. But in Romney's 2010 book No Apology: The Case for American Greatness, he wrote that "I believe that climate change is occurring - the reduction in the size of global ice caps is hard to ignore. I also believe that human activity is a contributing factor. I am uncertain how much of the warming, however, is attributable to factors out of our control."

Then, in a town hall in New Hampshire in June 2011, a voter asked Romney whether he thought climate change existed and was caused by human activity. Here's part of Romney's answer (the full exchange can be seen on C-SPAN starting at the 21:00 mark):

"I don't speak for the scientific community, of course. But I believe the world is getting warmer. I can't prove that, but I believe based on what I read that the world is getting warmer. And number two, I believe that humans contribute to that. I don't know how much our contribution is to that, because I know there have been periods of greater heat and warmth in the past, but I believe that we contribute to that. So I think it's important for us to reduce our emissions of pollutants and greenhouse gases that may well be significant contributors to the climate change and the global warming that you're seeing."

Romney added that he opposed the United States unilaterally adopting a cap-and-trade plan if other countries weren't taking similar steps to reduce greenhouse emissions. A cap-and-trade plan would require industry to pay for their carbon emissions with new permit fees. There would be a limited amount of permits (the "cap"), but companies would be able to buy and sell the permits among themselves (the "trade").

Later, in an Aug. 24, 2011, event in Lebanon, N.H., Romney said, "Do I think the world's getting hotter? Yeah, I don't know that, but I think that it is. I don't know if it's mostly caused by humans. ... What I'm not willing to do is spend trillions of dollars on something I don't know the answer to."

And Romney discussed the issue in an Oct. 3, 2011, interview with reporters and editors of the New Hampshire Union Leader. (It was recorded here by C-SPAN; check around the 22-minute mark.)

Romney said, "One, I believe what I said before, I think it's getting warmer. Two, I believe we contribute to it. And three, I don't know by how much -- a lot or a little. And so I am not willing to adopt multi-trillion dollar programs to reduce greenhouse gases in America. They don't call it America warming, they call it global warming."

Both the book excerpt and the three New Hampshire comments suggest pretty clearly that Romney sees a role for humans in climate change, though he's less committal about how large an impact humans are having.

But at a campaign event in Pittsburgh, Pa., a few months later, Romney offered a somewhat different perspective. His comments were videotaped and promoted by the liberal advocacy website Think Progress.

A voter asked Romney, "What is your position on man-made global warming and would you reject legislation, such as cap and trade, which is based on the idea of man-made global warming?"

"My view is that we don't know what's causing climate change on this planet. And the idea of spending trillions and trillions of dollars to try to reduce CO2 emissions is not the right course for us. My view with regards to energy policy is pretty straightforward. I want us to become energy secure and independent of the oil cartels. And that means let's aggressively develop our oil, our gas, our coal, our nuclear power."

Much of Romney's underlying policy proposals -- reducing foreign oil dependence; increasing the use of natural gas and nuclear power; and opposing cap-and-trade -- remained the same in both comments.

But this time he left out human activity as a cause of global warming. Rather than saying, as he had in the past, that we don't know how much of a role humans are playing in climate, Romney said, "We don't know what's causing climate change on this planet."

After Romney's remarks were widely reported, Romney spokeswoman Andrea Saul told the Boston Globe that Romney was not flip-flopping.

"This is ridiculous," she said in a statement. "Gov. Romney's view on climate change has not changed. He believes it's occurring, and that human activity contributes to it, but he doesn't know to what extent. He opposes cap and trade, and he refused to sign such a plan when he was governor."

We were unable to find any remarks since then about whether he thought human beings contribute to global warming or not.

Our ruling

In June 2011, Romney said he believed "the world is getting warmer" and that "humans contribute to that." In October 2011, by contrast, Romney said that "we don't know what's causing climate change on this planet."

It's unclear to us whether this was an inadvertent omission or a calculated attempt to say divergent things to different audiences. Because Romney, in our view, is savvy enough to know the difference between suggesting a human role in climate change and leaving it out, we think it's reasonable to perceive Romney as taking two distinct stances in these two statements. We rate this a Half Flip.

\* \* \*

About this statement:

Published: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 4:03 p.m.

Subjects: Environment

Sources: C-SPAN, "Mitt Romney Town Hall Meeting," June 3, 2011; C-SPAN, "Mitt Romney Interviewed by New Hampshire Newspaper," Oct. 3, 2011; Think Progress, "Romney Flips To Denial: 'We Don't Know What's Causing Climate Change,'" Oct. 28, 2011; Boston Globe, "Romney makes new shift in global warming position," Oct. 28, 2011; National Review, "Romney and Climate Change," Oct. 28, 2011; CBS News, "Mitt Romney's shifting views on climate change," Oct. 28, 2011; CNN, "On climate change, Dems and Perry find Romney shifting," Oct. 28, 2011; Grist.org, "Confused with a chance of flip-flop: Mitt Romney's views on climate and energy ," Jan. 4, 2012; PolitiFact, "Mitt Romney's views on climate change have changed, says DNC," Nov. 30, 2011
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Caption: PHOTO (2) VIDEO - YouTube: Mitt Romney's comments at the Consol Energy Center in Pittsburgh have become a point of contention in judging the Republican candidate's views on humans and global warming.
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

Not all renewable energy is used to create electricity. For instance, some renewable energy is used for transportation, primarily ethanol in gasoline. This ethanol is counted in the "energy" category but not in the "electricity" category. Much smaller amounts of biomass are used for heating in colder locales or in industrial facilities like paper mills.

"I've got a plan to control more of our own energy," [Barack Obama] said. "After 30 years of inaction, we raised fuel standards so that by the middle of the next decade, your cars and trucks will go twice as far on a gallon of gas. That will save you money. It will help the environment. We've doubled our use of renewable energy, and thousands of Americans now have jobs building wind turbines and long-lasting batteries."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

The statement

"We've doubled our use of renewable energy."

President Barack Obama, in a speech in Seminole Sept. 8

The ruling: MOSTLY FALSE

\* \* \*

During his Pinellas County rally Sept. 8, President Barack Obama touted the nation's achievements in expanding the use of renewable energy.

"I've got a plan to control more of our own energy," Obama said. "After 30 years of inaction, we raised fuel standards so that by the middle of the next decade, your cars and trucks will go twice as far on a gallon of gas. That will save you money. It will help the environment. We've doubled our use of renewable energy, and thousands of Americans now have jobs building wind turbines and long-lasting batteries."

We wondered whether Obama was correct that we've "doubled our use of renewable energy."

We began by asking the Obama campaign to back up the claim. A spokeswoman cited three statistics from the Energy Information Administration, a federal agency that collects energy data.

- Net electricity generation from wind, which more than doubled between 2008 and 2011.

- Net electricity generation from solar has more than doubled over the same period.

- During the first five months of 2012, the United States has produced more electricity from wind than it did in all of 2008.

We checked the data and found out that all of these comparisons are accurate. But that doesn't tell the whole story. The problem for Obama is not that the trend is inaccurate, but that he used the wrong words to describe it.

More than solar, wind

The agency's tables include several additional categories of renewable energy, including hydroelectric, geothermal and various types of biomass energy. If you put them all together by BTUs, wind energy in 2011 accounted for 11 percent of all renewable-energy production. That's not 11 percent of all energy production, including coal, oil and natural gas - that's 11 percent of just the production from renewable sources. Solar, meanwhile, was even smaller. It accounted for about 1 percent of all renewable energy production.

If you look at all types of electricity generation from renewables, the increase isn't double between 2008 and 2011 - it's 55 percent.

Energy vs. electricity

Not all renewable energy is used to create electricity. For instance, some renewable energy is used for transportation, primarily ethanol in gasoline. This ethanol is counted in the "energy" category but not in the "electricity" category. Much smaller amounts of biomass are used for heating in colder locales or in industrial facilities like paper mills.

So, to use Obama's words, did renewable energy - not just electricity - double between 2008 and 2011? No. The increase in megawatt hours was about 25 percent, according to EIA data and estimates.

Our ruling

Obama said, "We've doubled our use of renewable energy." But while the nation has made strides in expanding electricity generated by wind and solar, the increase for all kinds of energy, and for all types of renewables, was about 25 percent. We rate the statement Mostly False.

This ruling has been edited for print. Read the full version at PolitiFact.com.

Credit: Times staff writer
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

Supports proposals "to devote billions of dollars annually to state game and fish agencies and federal land management agencies to help them ensure that fish and wildlife survive the impacts of climate change."

We spoke with Taryn Tuss, communications director at the White House Council on Environmental Quality who said these programs focus on creating "climate change adaptation strategies, improving climate-related science and monitoring of natural resources, and conserving and restoring vital landscapes."

The only realistic way for [Barack Obama] to secure billions for fish and game would have been through the passage of the cap and trade bill. While cap and trade didn't pass, the administration has supported the goals initially outlined in the promise by supporting agencies that run climate change programs. We rate this a Compromise.

**LINKS**
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Fund proposals to help fish and game survive climate change

Supports proposals "to devote billions of dollars annually to state game and fish agencies and federal land management agencies to help them ensure that fish and wildlife survive the impacts of climate change."

Sources: "Barack Obama: Supporting The Rights and Traditions of Sportsmen"

Subjects: Environment, Recreation

\* \* \*

The Obameter: COMPROMISE

During his campaign, Obama promised to help fish and wildlife survive the impacts of climate change with billions of dollars in funding.

The billion dollar promise was based on a piece of failed legislation called the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 -- also known as the cap and trade bill.

This bill would have done just what the name suggests, cap greenhouse gas emissions and then allow groups to buy and sell emissions permits. The goal was to use a market-based mechanism to lower overall emissions by gradually reducing the cap.

The bill included a financing component that would have distributed funding to various climate change programs.

While Obama pushed for the inclusion of a Natural Resources Climate Change Adaptation Fund in the climate change legislation, never passed.

But Obama has included funding in his yearly budgets that aims to accomplish similar goals, and yearly budgets show that climate change funding has increased during this administration.

Most recently, the 2012 budget provides $2.6 billion to the multi-agency U.S. Global Change Research Program which is a 5.6 percent increase from last year.

The administration has also invested $320 million in programs under the U.S. Interior Department to address climate change.

We spoke with Taryn Tuss, communications director at the White House Council on Environmental Quality who said these programs focus on creating "climate change adaptation strategies, improving climate-related science and monitoring of natural resources, and conserving and restoring vital landscapes."

In addition, she pointed us to a government-wide initiative to "incorporate adaptation into agency planning and risk assessment, with the goal of protecting infrastructure and other taxpayer investments, natural resources, and public health."

The only realistic way for Obama to secure billions for fish and game would have been through the passage of the cap and trade bill. While cap and trade didn't pass, the administration has supported the goals initially outlined in the promise by supporting agencies that run climate change programs. We rate this a Compromise.

\* \* \*

Sources:

EOP, Meeting the Challenges of Global Change, accessed Oct. 18, 2012

The White House, The U.S. Global Change Research Program in the 2012 Budget, Oct. 8, 2012

The White House, Federal Actions for a Climate Resilient Nation, accessed Oct. 8, 2012

Interview with Naomi Edelson, director of state and federal wildlife partnerships, National Wildlife Federation, Oct. 9 2012

Interview with Taryn Tuss, communications director, White House Council on Environmental Quality, Oct. 17 2012

Govtrack, HR 2454

Climate Science Watch, President"s 2013 Budget Requests 6% for climate and global change research, Feb. 14, 2012
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

If Gov. Rick Scott wants to see Florida's future as the planet warms and sea levels rise, he should take a drive on State Road A1A along the Fort Lauderdale strip where street flooding from the Atlantic Ocean occurred off and on for weeks last year. The flooding was blamed on a confluence of high winds, a low-pressure system, Superstorm Sandy and the moon's pull. And while it's impossible to say if global warming is the cause, it is certainly true that the oceans are higher because of a warming climate, meaning more coastal flooding. The governor and the Legislature should finally acknowledge that the scientific community is right and climate change is real.

**LINKS**
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If Gov. Rick Scott wants to see Florida's future as the planet warms and sea levels rise, he should take a drive on State Road A1A along the Fort Lauderdale strip where street flooding from the Atlantic Ocean occurred off and on for weeks last year. The flooding was blamed on a confluence of high winds, a low-pressure system, Superstorm Sandy and the moon's pull. And while it's impossible to say if global warming is the cause, it is certainly true that the oceans are higher because of a warming climate, meaning more coastal flooding. The governor and the Legislature should finally acknowledge that the scientific community is right and climate change is real.

Sandy was a wake-up call for New York City and much of the Eastern Seaboard. The devastation prompted Michael Bloomberg, the independent mayor of New York City and a former Republican, to publicly endorse President Barack Obama's re-election bid. He said that climate change should be a bipartisan concern and that Republican challenger Mitt Romney had abandoned his onetime interest in the issue.

Scott should join in Bloomberg's pragmatism. Scientific studies continue to pile up evidence that we are contributing to a warming planet by polluting the air with heat-trapping gases. Sea levels have risen 8 to 10 inches in the past 100 years, and that rise is accelerating. With 2.5 million Floridians living along threatened coastline, Scott should show some of the postelection flexibility he has demonstrated on health care and embrace the science of climate change, even if it challenges Republican Party orthodoxy.

One recent study published in the journal Nature Climate Change found that by continuing on our current path of greenhouse gas pollution, the seas will rise 5 feet by the first half of the next century. That would wipe out coastal areas of Florida, submerging 94 percent of Miami Beach and 20 percent of Miami. But the study also suggests that even if we immediately and significantly cut fossil fuel pollution, the best we could do is slow the seas' rise.

That means preparation has to proceed along dual tracks. First the nation has to commit to demonstrable goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions domestically and internationally. The first international climate change agreement, the 1997 Kyoto protocol, was one the United States signed but never ratified. Second, federal, state and local planners should prepare for rising seas by building them into designs for infrastructure as well as into zoning plans.

Scott could be at the forefront of this planning process and join with Bloomberg to depoliticize the issue and adopt a long-term strategy for Florida. All he has to do is take a ride along the coast and see what is at stake for the future of the state.
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

In a rowboat, it is not the number of people but their combined weight that matters. For the planet, this is the "effective population;" it is the number of people multiplied by their average impact that is the total burden of the human footprint on the planet. As you might guess, an American has a much bigger footprint than someone from the developing world, where population growth is fastest.

This chart compares the "carrying capacity" (the biocapacity) of China and the United States with the "carbon footprint" of an average resident of each country. The United States has a higher biocapacity per capita, but it also has a far bigger average footprint. Both countries are outpacing their landmasses' capacities, but the gap is much wider for the United States. (A hectare is 2.47 acres.)

This chart shows the trend lines for the "carrying capacity" of the Earth and the globe's rising population. When the two lines cross, the planet can't support the people. A tipping point occurs when the cascading bad effects multiply and reinforce each other's damaging effects, bringing trouble faster and faster. But reducing our footprint can "bend" the population curve down by reducing the load each of us places on the planet, and letting the Earth heal itself can "bend" the carrying capacity curve upward. Changing those two trends would keep the lines from crossing.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

The news is grim. New measurements show that the climate-changing gas carbon dioxide is at the highest atmospheric concentrations - 400 parts per million - in at least 3 million years. Evolved human beings have never seen it like this. And yet a recent Gallup poll shows that only a minority of Americans - 50 percent of Democrats and 18 percent of Republicans - believe that global warming will "pose a serious threat to them or to their way of life during their lifetime."

With such a disconnect and so little political will, action seems impossible. But there is a way. There are many things we can do ourselves if we shift our focus from climate change to the well-established biological concept of carrying capacity.

Carrying capacity is the maximum population size that the environment can sustain indefinitely, given the food, habitat, water and other necessities available in the environment.

We'll get to the math later, but it works out that if only a minority of the population reduced their footprint by 25 percent right now, eventually increasing to half the population by 2050, it might be possible to avoid crossing a point of no return, a tipping point for the planet. That is not an unreasonable possibility. To be sure, individuals will still need to push institutions to change, but the answer, fortunately can start within ourselves.

Let's begin with an analogy. Think of a rowboat that can hold a limited number of people. Add one too many, and the boat will sink. Everyone drowns. Likewise, the planet can support a limited number of people. Add too many and its capacity to support life will collapse.

In a rowboat, it is not the number of people but their combined weight that matters. For the planet, this is the "effective population;" it is the number of people multiplied by their average impact that is the total burden of the human footprint on the planet. As you might guess, an American has a much bigger footprint than someone from the developing world, where population growth is fastest.

Additionally, a rowboat, when exposed to stormy weather, rocks and dips in ways it did not when the water was still. Nature is the same. When a growing population cuts down trees to clear land to grow food, the result is soil erosion decreasing the amount of food to feed the increasing number of people who are cutting down the trees.

When collapse occurs in nature, there is a "tipping point" in which the accelerating demands produce a rapid decline in capacity. The process is similar to the overcrowded rowboat that, with the addition of a small amount of extra weight, starts to take on water and quickly sinks. Once the tipping point is crossed, neither the boat nor nature can support life. For thousands of years this has not been an issue for the planet. It is today.

Fortunately, we can do something about it. And in surprising ways, the math works in our favor, if enough of us change our ways. If, between now and 2015, just 3 percent of the effective population would reduce their total footprint by 25 percent, and by 2020 the percent doing so doubled to 6 percent, and by 2030 double again to 12.5 percent, and by 2040 to 25 percent, and by 2050 to 50 percent, then the total footprint of the effective population would be reduced, the planet could start to recover, and the danger of crossing the tipping point would be averted. The collective effective footprint of the human population on the Earth would start to decrease at around 8 billion, even though the actual population is projected to reach 9 billion by 2050.

The impact of total distances traveled and the efficiency of transportation, the amount and sources of energy used, and what we eat and how it is produced can each be divided into subcategories, which can be further broken down to the number of gallons of gasoline, diesel and aviation fuel refined; the tons of fertilizer and pesticides used; the number of wind farms created; and the BTUs of coal and oil that must be remain in the ground. These can all be measured. They are all subject to public political control, and the policies required to regulate these events are known.

This challenge is of particular relevance to those of us living in the United States, because we are putting in jeopardy our way of life, far more so than China, which is our major competitor.

While China contributes more to carbon emissions, its population is four times larger. Per person, it is we who are the biggest offender in the world of overuse of natural resources. We have more to lose than any other nation if, collectively, the human race exceeds the carrying capacity of the planet. And it is within our power, personally and politically, to reduce our footprint and the effective size of our population - in other words, the per person load we put on the planet.

A small percentage of people making regular small contributions, and encouraging progressively more people to join with them, can have a large cumulative effect. These individual efforts are all necessary, but they alone are insufficient. Rather, they must be our daily reminder that public policy issues, such as effective mass transit to replace commuting by car, the infrastructure of alternative energy sources and national policies independent of the short-term self-interest of big agriculture, big oil and multinational corporations are also essential. Averting a crisis in our lifetimes doesn't make the Earth habitable forever.

The same new dire report on carbon dioxide offers one hopeful and helpful note. It points out that atmospheric levels will briefly dip this summer before heading back up to ever more dangerous levels. Why? Trees will leaf out and absorb carbon dioxide during photosynthesis in the Northern Hemisphere, which contains the majority of the Earth's land mass.

This temporary natural relief does not have to be seasonal. In the short term, we have direct personal control over hundreds of specific everyday actions, such as using fewer plastic water bottles, driving one less mile, eating less meat, planting a garden and eating seasonal local produce, among a long list. Every bit counts.

In the longer term, if a growing number of us change our personal ways, we will begin to build the necessary social and political awareness to shift our focus away from the abstract event of climate change to government and corporate accountability for specific and measurable policies and practices of not using more resources and producing more waste than the planet can replace or absorb in a year.

Add them up, and we can save the planet.

Edward Renner is a professor in the Honors College of the University of South Florida. He may be contacted at kerenner@usf.edu. The environmental data is from the Global Footprint Network data base: www.footprintnetwork.org. He wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times.

\* \* \*

World population growth

For 6,000 years of recorded history the number of people on Earth increased gradually. With industrialization, modern medicine and mechanized agriculture, the number of people has risen so rapidly that we are in danger of sinking the good ship Earth with all those aboard within the lifetime of the majority of people alive today. In relative terms, a house that held four people in 1940 would be home to 13 today. The solutions are ones we have to find now; there is not time for them to be left for our children to solve.

---

The U.S.-China overshoot

This chart compares the "carrying capacity" (the biocapacity) of China and the United States with the "carbon footprint" of an average resident of each country. The United States has a higher biocapacity per capita, but it also has a far bigger average footprint. Both countries are outpacing their landmasses' capacities, but the gap is much wider for the United States. (A hectare is 2.47 acres.)

The United States has been using more resources and producing more waste longer and to a greater extent than any other nation. Other countries have been our environmental creditors. Some are becoming resentful and unwilling to continue to carry our ecological deficit. Because we share a common planet, any effective solution must be a cooperative international response. We cannot other countries to indefinitely support the size of our overshoot at the relative expense of its own population. We are in a position to lead the world in a positive direction.

---

Avoiding the Tipping Point

This chart shows the trend lines for the "carrying capacity" of the Earth and the globe's rising population. When the two lines cross, the planet can't support the people. A tipping point occurs when the cascading bad effects multiply and reinforce each other's damaging effects, bringing trouble faster and faster. But reducing our footprint can "bend" the population curve down by reducing the load each of us places on the planet, and letting the Earth heal itself can "bend" the carrying capacity curve upward. Changing those two trends would keep the lines from crossing.

If over the next two years, 3 percent of the population reduces its footprint by 25 percent, and the percentage of the population doing so increased to 50 percent by 2050 the effective size of the human footprint would peak at 8 billion and then begin to decline. As a result of reversing our destruction of the biocapacity of the Earth, nature can begin the recovery process, such as allowing the rain forest to regenerate new areas and reclaim grass lands to sequester nitrous oxide and support grazing. We know that when nature is allowed to heal our biocapacity will slowly start to recover. For an interactive graphic to see the effects of different final participation rates and footprint reductions go to www.kernner.com/cc.htm.
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**ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)**

Why such divergent responses? One factor could be the precise wording of each poll. But a bigger difference is likely the pool of respondents. The LCV poll only counted answers from "registered voters ... who voted in the 2012 general election," while the Pew poll simply asked "adults." This means the poll results aren't comparable in an apples-to-apples fashion.

[Chris Murphy] said, "Only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening." It should be noted that Murphy cited a poll that had been paid for by an environmental group. Still, we couldn't find any poll with genuinely comparable data that clashed with Murphy's carefully worded assertion. We rate his statement True.

Sources: Chris Murphy, Senate Democrats' news conference on the Senate Climate Action Task Force, Jan. 14, 2014 (CQ subscribers only); League of Conservation Voters, Youth Survey summary findings, July 8-10, 2013; Pew Research Center, "GOP Deeply Divided Over Climate Change," Nov. 1, 2013; PolitiFact Rhode Island, "U.S. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse says most young Republicans think poorly of climate change deniers," Nov. 25, 2013; Email interview with [Karlyn Bowman], polling analyst at the American Enterprise Institute, Jan. 15, 2013

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

"Only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening."

Chris Murphy on Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 in remarks at a news conference

\* \* \*

THE RULING: TRUE

More than a dozen Senate Democrats called a news conference on Jan. 14, 2014, to draw attention to their efforts to curb climate change. One of those senators -- Chris Murphy, D-Conn. -- focused his remarks on the impact of public opinion on advancing an agenda on climate-change policy.

Murphy said that advocates for policies to address climate-change "have to convince Republicans -- and those who would stand against the action that we're proposing -- of the electoral consequences of continuing to ignore this issue. We have to tell Republicans that if they ultimately want to stop the hemorrhaging from young voters in this country, they need to start paying attention to this issue, because only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening."

We wondered whether Murphy's polling data was sound.

Thanks to some previous reporting by our colleagues at PolitiFact Rhode Island, we quickly found a poll that appears to be the source for Murphy's claim. It was commissioned by the League of Conservation Voters, an environmental group, and conducted by a polling team that included one Democratic firm and one Republican firm. The poll was taken between July 8 and July 10, 2013, with 600 respondents, all of whom were registered voters between 18 and 34 who voted in the 2012 general election.

The poll asked, "Which of the following best describes your view of climate change?" Here are the responses:

- Climate change is a severe threat that we must start addressing now: 55 percent

- Climate change is an issue to address in the years ahead, but it's not urgent now: 11 percent

- Climate change may be happening, but it's a natural event that humans can't affect: 27 percent

- Climate change is not really happening: 3 percent

- Don't know: 3 percent

This appears to support Murphy's claim.

We should note a few quibbles.

- The poll was paid for by an environmental group. We always believe it's worth noting whenever someone cites a poll paid for by a group with a perspective and a stake in the issue. However, the fact that two polling firms, one from each party, were included makes the poll somewhat more credible.

- On a subsequent question in the same poll -- "When, if ever, will the consequences of climate change personally affect people like you?" -- the number answering "never" was 6 percent. That's higher than 3 percent, though both are small percentages in the larger scheme of things.

- There's one other poll that asks a similar question and finds different results. But they aren't exactly comparable.

The Pew Research Center -- an independent polling organization -- surveyed a national sample of 1,504 adults age 18 or older between Oct. 9 and Oct. 13, 2013. One of the questions Pew asked was: "From what you've read and heard, is there solid evidence that the average temperature on earth has been getting warmer over the past few decades, or not?"

Among 18- to 29-year-olds, 73 percent said the earth is warming, and 18 percent said it was not warming -- quite a bit higher than the 3 percent from the other poll. The two polls use different age ranges, but if respondents up to age 34 were added in, that would likely increase the percentage of global-warming deniers further, since an even higher percentage of 30- to 49-year olds said there was no global warming -- 28 percent.

Why such divergent responses? One factor could be the precise wording of each poll. But a bigger difference is likely the pool of respondents. The LCV poll only counted answers from "registered voters ... who voted in the 2012 general election," while the Pew poll simply asked "adults." This means the poll results aren't comparable in an apples-to-apples fashion.

This difference might have posed a problem for Murphy, but he was careful with how he worded his claim. He said "3 percent of voters" -- not "3 percent of Americans." So we don't find fault on these grounds.

"Pollsters don't ask about climate change very often," said Karlyn Bowman, a polling analyst at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. "Most polls show that most people believe global warming is real. The question for policy makers is what kind of priority it should be, and here, many pollsters show it not to be very high."

Our ruling

Murphy said, "Only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening." It should be noted that Murphy cited a poll that had been paid for by an environmental group. Still, we couldn't find any poll with genuinely comparable data that clashed with Murphy's carefully worded assertion. We rate his statement True.

\* \* \*

About this statement:

Published: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 4:49 p.m.

Subjects: Environment, Polls and Public Opinion, Science
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**ABSTRACT**

Former lobbyist David Jolly may have spent too much time in Washington if he doesn't recognize the connection between Congress' role in setting environmental policies and campaigning in a vulnerable coastal county with rising high tides and flood concerns. Both Jolly, a Republican candidate for U.S. House District 13, and Lucas Overby, his Libertarian opponent, are refusing to acknowledge the overwhelming scientific evidence that humans have had an extensive impact on climate change and by extension, rising tides in Pinellas County and elsewhere. Theirs is an irresponsible position based on ignorance, or worse, pandering. Only Democrat Alex Sink has shown a commitment to helping turn the tide on climate change.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Former lobbyist David Jolly may have spent too much time in Washington if he doesn't recognize the connection between Congress' role in setting environmental policies and campaigning in a vulnerable coastal county with rising high tides and flood concerns. Both Jolly, a Republican candidate for U.S. House District 13, and Lucas Overby, his Libertarian opponent, are refusing to acknowledge the overwhelming scientific evidence that humans have had an extensive impact on climate change and by extension, rising tides in Pinellas County and elsewhere. Theirs is an irresponsible position based on ignorance, or worse, pandering. Only Democrat Alex Sink has shown a commitment to helping turn the tide on climate change.

Jolly told the Tampa Bay Times, "I don't think the impact that humans have had on our climate is so dramatic as it requires a significant shift in federal policy." Overby said he was skeptical "that we have radically altered the course of our planet." Both are speaking pablum to a cadre of science deniers who are more interested in protecting their own ignorance or economic interests than ensuring a future for the planet.

Their comments belie decades of research, including the fifth report of the well-regarded Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued last year that went further than ever before in linking climate change to human actions: "It is extremely likely that human influence on climate caused more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010. There is high confidence that this has warmed the ocean, melted snow and ice, raised global mean sea level and changed some climate extremes in the second half of the 20th century."

They're also ignoring research released just last week involving scientists at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg that showed high tides were exponentially rising in the Gulf of Mexico, doubling in just 20 years the risk of hurricane-induced flooding all along the coastline.

They are ignoring the very real successes of efforts such as the international 1989 Montreal Protocol that is now credited with phasing out nearly 100 ozone-damaging chlorofluorocarbons. Perhaps they also forgot it was conservative President Ronald Reagan, a victim of skin cancer, whose administration helped orchestrate the accord.

Every member of Congress should have an interest in impacting a phenomenon that has such devastating potential for Americans and their way of life. But for congressional candidates hailing from a peninsular county in a peninsular state where high tides are already rising due to climate change, it should be an automatic top priority. Jolly and Overby need to go back to their science books and learn some facts, not just talking points. And then they need to sign up to do something about it for the people they say they want to represent in Congress.
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Earth "has not warmed for the last 17 years."

Patrick Moore on Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 in an interview on 'Hannity'

\* \* \*

THE RULING: MOSTLY FALSE

Fox News pundit Sean Hannity set the stage for a screaming match on climate change when he invited liberal Bob Beckel of The Five to debate Patrick Moore, a former Greenpeace activist who says there is no proof man is contributing to a warming planet.

Beckel criticized Moore for his work as a spokesman for the nuclear energy industry and for saying carbon emissions go back into trees and food rather than the atmosphere.

"Come on, Patrick. You know better than that," Beckel said during the March 11 edition of Hannity.

But Moore said cries about climate change are actually just about fits of weather.

"Basically, they're just saying weather these days," Moore said. "They're saying the weather is climate change, but that's not true. Weather is just weather, like the cold weather we're getting this year. It has not warmed for the last 17 years. We know that for sure. And that brings into question the whole hypothesis."

PunditFact wanted to know if the Earth has not warmed for the last 17 years, and what it means if anything for the theory of climate change.

We found clues, and seeming contradictions to his claim, in the PolitiFact archive.

Lately it's been hot a lot

President Barack Obama warned the nation there will be consequences from not doing more to combat climate change in his 2013 State of the Union address, pointing out "the 12 hottest years on record have all come in the last 15."

PolitiFact rated his statement True. (Actually it's 13 or 14 of the last 15.)

But that doesn't necessarily rule out Moore's claim about the earth not getting warmer lately. The statements can co-exist, with some additional context.

Moore's claim is a popular argument of people who say climate change isn't real. The problem is it is cherry-picked and leaves out the rest of the story about earth's dramatic temperature increases over the last century.

NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies tracks global land-ocean temperatures using a temperature index.

As you can see, Earth's land-ocean temperatures escalated starting in the 1970s, setting off a new era of rising sea levels, increased greenhouse gas emissions and melting sea ice. Temperatures spiked about 17 years ago in 1998, an outlier year that involved a strong El Nino with abnormally warm ocean temperatures.

Since then, temperatures have remained relatively, but not entirely flat.

That's the basis for Moore's claim.

There are several problems with his analysis, however.

Data for 2014 isn't available yet. So really there are only 16 data points (years) between 1998 and 2014. If you include 1997 to the analysis, Moore is clearly wrong.

The years 2005 and 2010 were both warmer than 1998, though only slightly. That also makes Moore's statement technically inaccurate, though most scientists agree that temperatures have remained relatively flat recently.

Moore cherry-picked a year when temperatures spiked. "What was an extraordinary event in 1998 is now the new normal," said Goddard Institute program analyst Reto Ruedy, program manager at NASA's Goddard Institute.

Moore would be incorrect if he chose 1999, 1997, 1996 or any year before that.

"If you start with an extremely warm year, the warming trend going forward is going to be mostly flat," said Gordon Hamilton, associate research professor at the Climate Change Institute at the University of Maine.

"You could easily choose 1999 and 1996 and you would find that there's an upward trend," said Kevin Trenberth, a distinguished senior scientist in the climate analysis section at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo. "It's cherry-picking to get the result that he apparently desires."

Moore's response

While Moore used the 17-year-statistic on Hannity to make the argument that climate change isn't happening, he told us the figure "does not prove much."

Moore said NOAA and NASA recordkeeping only go back 150 years and the planet's temperature has fluctuated over the course of time. It is cooler now than for "most of life history," he said.

"It is a pause, flat, whatever you want to call it, for 17 years," Moore said.

Hamilton and Ruedy dismissed Moore's qualms, saying the 150-year record is reliable to determine statistically significant trends. For pre-19th century estimates, scientists use other methods, such as tree rings and ice core bubbles, to detect climate trends, Ruedy said.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a group operating under the United Nations that reviews climate change research, has concluded the warming of the climate is "unprecedented over decades to millennia."

Moore's Greenpeace ties

A final note about Moore. In his interview on Hannity and in many other places, Moore has been described as a "founder" of Greenpeace. The organization, however, disputes that.

Greenpeace devotes a webpage to explaining Moore's lack of credentials, though they agree he was involved in the group's early days. The group was founded in 1970 as the Don't Make a Wave Committee with the goal of stopping an American nuclear weapons test on Amchitka Island in the Aleutians. Moore, a college student, wrote a letter to the group in 1971 asking to join the crew of activists sailing to protest the nuclear test.

Moore was one of three Greenpeace members on board the Phyllis Cormack, which carried a dozen passengers to Amchitka Island for the protest. Greenpeace says the group's founders include seven people, but not Moore.

Greenpeace leaders voted Moore out of his positions as director of Greenpeace Canada and one of five directors of Greenpeace International, and Moore left in 1986, said Greenpeace spokesman David Pomerantz. He served as a consultant and co-chairman of the nuclear industry-funded Clean and Safe Energy Coalition until he retired from it in 2013.

Our ruling

Moore said the whole theory of climate change is called into question because "it has not warmed for the last 17 years."

It's true that global surface temperatures have remained relatively flat for 17 years, since 1998. However, both 2005 and 2010 were warmer than 1998.

Moore's statement alone ignores that the first decade of the 21st century was the warmest on record.

And Moore is cherry-picking a timeframe to support his argument by starting at an extremely warm year. Global surface temperatures have risen, for instance, if you started at 1999, 1996, or any year before that.

Moore's statement contains an element of truth, but ignores critical facts that would give a different impression. We rate it Mostly False.

\* \* \*
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**Illustration**

Caption: PHOTO (2) CHART: The index shows the temperature anomaly of each year. The temperature anomaly shows how a year's land-ocean temperatures compares with the longterm average. A higher anomaly, such as 0.67 degrees Celsius in 2010, shows how much warmer a year was than the longterm average. A negative anomaly, last seen in 1976, indicates a cooler year than the referenced period.
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**ABSTRACT**

The report spends no time on the political debate about whether climate change is real: "Evidence for changes in Earth's climate can be found from the top of the atmosphere to the depths of the oceans. ... This warming has triggered many other changes to the Earth's climate. Snow and ice cover have decreased in most areas. Atmospheric water vapor is increasing in the lower atmosphere because a warmer atmosphere can hold more water. Sea level is increasing because water expands as it warms and because melting ice on land adds water to the oceans."

The report is "the loudest and clearest alarm bell to date" about the need to take action on climate change, John P. Holdren, who heads up the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, said in a Tuesday conference call with reporters. "It's already affecting every region of the country."

Southeastern states such as Florida, the report says, are "especially vulnerable to sea level rise, extreme heat events and decreased water availability." That means "large numbers of cities, roads, railways, ports, airports, oil and gas facilities and water supplies are at low elevations and potentially vulnerable."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

In a federal report being called "the loudest and clearest alarm bell to date" regarding climate change, the Tampa Bay area is labeled as one of three areas in Florida particularly vulnerable to rising sea levels, with the others being Miami and Apalachicola.

The report, the Third National Climate Assessment, also warns of increases in harmful algae blooms off Florida's coast, worsening seasonal allergies for people already made miserable by springtime pollen and heavier rainstorms and flooding in low-lying areas, such as the storm that clobbered the Panhandle last week.

Unveiled Tuesday, the report, a product of five years of work by a team of 60 scientists, spells out that climate change is not something awaiting in the future - it's affecting life now.

Based on weather records going back to the 1800s, the period from 2001-2012 was the warmest on record globally. Summers are lasting longer across the United States, and storms are dumping more rain than ever before.

Meanwhile sea levels already have risen by about 8 inches since reliable record keeping began in 1880 and are projected to rise another 1 to 4 feet by 2100. That's already worsening rain-related flooding in the streets of coastal cities such as Miami.

The report spends no time on the political debate about whether climate change is real: "Evidence for changes in Earth's climate can be found from the top of the atmosphere to the depths of the oceans. ... This warming has triggered many other changes to the Earth's climate. Snow and ice cover have decreased in most areas. Atmospheric water vapor is increasing in the lower atmosphere because a warmer atmosphere can hold more water. Sea level is increasing because water expands as it warms and because melting ice on land adds water to the oceans."

The cause, it says flatly, is "human activities, primarily the burning of fossil fuels."

The report is "the loudest and clearest alarm bell to date" about the need to take action on climate change, John P. Holdren, who heads up the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, said in a Tuesday conference call with reporters. "It's already affecting every region of the country."

Unlike global reports from the United Nations' International Panel on Climate Change, this report focuses strictly on the impacts on the United States. It splits the country into eight regions and examines the impact on each, as well as discussing ways to adapt.

Southeastern states such as Florida, the report says, are "especially vulnerable to sea level rise, extreme heat events and decreased water availability." That means "large numbers of cities, roads, railways, ports, airports, oil and gas facilities and water supplies are at low elevations and potentially vulnerable."

During hurricanes and tropical storms, "homes and infrastructure in low areas are increasingly prone to flooding," the report notes. "As a result, insurance costs will increase and people will move away from vulnerable areas."

Given Florida's porous limestone geology, a rising sea spells bad news for the drinking supply. Salty water pushing inland will invade the aquifer, tainting it and forcing local and state officials to find other, more expensive sources, the report says. That affects not just homeowners but also businesses and farmers.

An upcoming follow-up report, expected within a few months, will spell out ways local and state governments can try to cope, such as raising highways and moving hospitals and power plants inland.

In state parks on the coast, the signs of a rising sea are easy for scientists to spot. At Waccasassa State Park in Levy County, palm trees have been toppling over dead as rising saltwater creeps up the beach. At Rookery Bay Preserve near Naples, saltwater mangroves have invaded what used to be freshwater marshes.

Tidal charts in Key West, which date back to before the Civil War, have documented a rise of 9 inches in the past century. Tidal flooding that used to be a rare occurrence in Key West now happens so frequently that some businesses on the city's famed Duval Street have stockpiled sandbags for quick deployment.

However, Gov. Rick Scott has said he does not believe climate change is real. As a result, the state Department of Environmental Protection has no specific programs aimed at dealing with climate change. Spokeswoman Dee Ann Miller said the agency has "various programs ... indirectly working on projects and collecting data that may be used for the purposes of studying climate change."

Craig Pittman can be reached at craig@tampabay.com. Follow him on Twitter @craigtimes.
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**ABSTRACT**

Three years ago, [Rick Scott] made his position plainer. "I've not been convinced that there's any man-made climate change," he said in a 2011 interview.

When a Tampa Bay Times reporter asked Scott last week whether he thinks sea level rise is a threat to his house, he replied, "No. I'm not a scientist but I can tell you what, we're going to make sure we continue to make the right investments in the state to take care of our environment. We love living here."

PHOTO - Naples Daily News: Gov. Rick Scott seems unconcerned about climate change. But with a waterfront Naples mansion, he might want to rethink. "He's definitely in one of the most vulnerable positions," said a planner, adding that the sea's creeping up on him already. PHOTO - New York Times: Bozon Jeremie, a tourist from France, crosses a flooded intersection during high tide in Miami Beach. With an average elevation of 4.4 feet and some 7 miles of beaches, the town is already flooding more often from high tides than heavy rains. PHOTO (4)

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

This month, a new report written by a group of scientists said that climate change was not only real, but it was already affecting people in the United States, particularly in Florida, where 75 percent of all residents live near the coast.

Three of those Florida coastal residents are among the state's most prominent Republicans - Gov. Rick Scott, U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio and former Gov. Jeb Bush. Shouldn't they be worried?

The day after the Third National Climate Change Assessment report came out, the New York Times said Scott would not respond to its questions about what Florida is doing about sea level rise. When a Palm Beach television station asked him about it, Scott said the state's emergency management division would handle any flooding problems - period.

Three years ago, Scott made his position plainer. "I've not been convinced that there's any man-made climate change," he said in a 2011 interview.

Scott has a vested interest in how Florida fares amid the rising seas. He owns a $9.2 million mansion in Naples that sits right on the beach, a foot above sea level and about 200 feet from the water. He and his wife, Ann, bought the house for $11.5 million in 2003 when they moved to Florida from Connecticut.

"He's definitely in one of the most vulnerable positions," said Jim Beever of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council.

When a Tampa Bay Times reporter asked Scott last week whether he thinks sea level rise is a threat to his house, he replied, "No. I'm not a scientist but I can tell you what, we're going to make sure we continue to make the right investments in the state to take care of our environment. We love living here."

Despite Scott's denial, Beever said, the sea is creeping up on him already. Along that stretch of the Collier County coastline, he said, it has been rising at the rate of about 8 to 9 inches over the past century.

Because Florida is so flat, even a few inches of increase means water pushes a long way inland. For instance, 60 miles north of Naples, the mangroves lining the shores of Charlotte Harbor have retreated the length of a football field from where they were 50 years ago, Beever said.

The rising sea will lead to greater beach erosion and other problems, Beever said, but what poses the most immediate threat to Scott's home is not the slow creep of higher waves. It's the increasing reach of the storm surge that accompanies tropical storms and hurricanes.

On Scott's beach, he said, the water will sweep in from two directions: pushing in from the Gulf of Mexico but also swirling up the road in front of the house because "the road is lower than the house. The road will flood before the water reaches the foundations of the houses."

Beever said the storm surge threat to Scott's mansion illustrates one of his favorite sayings: "Belief in climate change is optional, but participation is mandatory."

Two other prominent Floridians who didn't return the New York Times' calls about the climate change report were Rubio and Bush, both said to be contemplating runs for the presidency.

Rubio subsequently told ABC News, "I do not believe that human activity is causing these dramatic changes to our climate the way these scientists are portraying it." He told the Miami Herald last week he believes the climate could be changing but has doubts about whether humans are causing it.

Bush has kept mum. The last time he said anything about climate change was in 2011, when he told Fox News that "global warming may be real" but "it is not unanimous among scientists that it is disproportionately man-made."

Both Rubio and Bush live in Miami, identified in the climate report as being one spot in America that's particularly vulnerable to a rising sea. A coalition of South Florida governments studying climate change has settled on 2 feet as the likely rate of sea level rise by 2050.

But neither man has a place on the beach like Scott. Bush lives 2 miles from the water in Coral Gables, and Rubio is 4 miles inland, in West Miami. Bush's place is 17 feet above sea level while Rubio's is 12.

That doesn't mean they can avoid the consequences of climate change, said Harold Wanless, who chairs the geological sciences department at the University of Miami. The sea level will affect "our gravity-fed sewage lines, our roads and our electrical connectivity," Wanless said.

The streets in Miami Beach, which has an average elevation of 4.4 feet and some 7 miles of beaches, are already flooding more often from high tides rather than from heavy rains. Rubio should not count on those flooding woes being confined to the coast, said David Enfield, a climate scientist with the University of Miami.

On the western side of Miami where he lives, the water table is close to the surface and pressure from a rising ocean will push that even higher, causing frequent floods in those inland areas.

"If I were he, I'd be worried," Enfield said.

The worst thing, said Jim Murley of the South Florida Regional Planning Council, will be the loss of water to drink. Miami-Dade County residents get their water from the Biscayne Aquifer. The rising Atlantic will push saltwater into the aquifer and make those drinking wells unusable, he said, forcing local leaders to hunt for more expensive sources.

One Florida official who does not deny the existence of climate change is Sen. Bill Nelson. Last month Nelson, a Democrat, convened a special Senate hearing on climate change in Miami Beach, which he described as "ground zero" for impacts from human alterations to the Earth's climate.

While he was born in Miami, Nelson is a longtime resident of Orlando, in a house that's 17 feet above sea level and about 30 miles from the Atlantic Ocean. Sea level rise is unlikely to affect his property any time soon. Instead, according to the climate report, he has to worry about increased wildfires, less rain, longer summers and a longer allergy season.

Times staff writer Jamal Thalji contributed to this report. Craig Pittman can be reached at craig@tampabay.com. Follow him on Twitter at @craigtimes.

\* \* \*

Rick Scott

Distance to water .04 miles

Elevation 1 foot
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Distance to water 4 miles
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Distance to water 2 miles

Elevation 17 feet

Bill Nelson

Distance to water 33 miles

Elevation 17 feet
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Caption: PHOTO - Naples Daily News: Gov. Rick Scott seems unconcerned about climate change. But with a waterfront Naples mansion, he might want to rethink. "He's definitely in one of the most vulnerable positions," said a planner, adding that the sea's creeping up on him already. PHOTO - New York Times: Bozon Jeremie, a tourist from France, crosses a flooded intersection during high tide in Miami Beach. With an average elevation of 4.4 feet and some 7 miles of beaches, the town is already flooding more often from high tides than heavy rains. PHOTO (4)
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**ABSTRACT**

[Jeff Chanton] delivered their letter to the governor Tuesday asking for the meeting to explain to him the impact human-induced global warming will have on Florida. The letter has prompted media attention for Chanton all week, and on Friday, after [Charlie Crist]'s call and the governor's updated answer, he said he was "very pleased."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Democratic candidate for governor Charlie Crist fueled the climate wars Friday and called Florida State University oceanography professor Jeff Chanton offering to meet with the scientists who asked to meet with Gov. Rick Scott.

Scott said this week that someone in his administration would meet with the 10 climate scientists from universities and colleges across the state, but after Crist agreed to meet them, the governor also agreed.

"I would be happy to meet with them. We have a great record on the environment and restoration projects in Florida," Scott said in a statement released by his campaign.

The state's top climate experts want to explain the research that shows the impact human-induced global warming is having on Florida.

Chanton delivered their letter to the governor Tuesday asking for the meeting to explain to him the impact human-induced global warming will have on Florida. The letter has prompted media attention for Chanton all week, and on Friday, after Crist's call and the governor's updated answer, he said he was "very pleased."

Crist was governor when climate change policies had become politically popular for Republicans like former California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger. Crist launched a series of aggressive policies aimed at targeting greenhouse gas emissions.

The GOP-controlled Legislature has since dismantled nearly all of those programs with the agreement of Scott, who in 2010 signaled he was in the climate change deniers camp.

Credit: Times/Herald Tallahassee Bureau
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**ABSTRACT**

California is in the forefront of regulations to address carbon emissions that are causing climate change. Gov. Jerry Brown said that's in part because Washington won't act. Brown told journalist George Stephanopolous in May that "there's virtually no Republican who accepts the science that virtually is unanimous. ... There's just political denial for various reasons, best known to those people who are in denial." We found few Republicans in Congress who accept the prevailing scientific conclusion that global warming is real and man-made; we named them in our fact-check, concludingBrown's qualified statement was Mostly True.

In an interview on Fox News in May, [Marco Rubio] said he never denied that the climate was changing, but he also said that "the left loves to go around saying there is a consensus" when there is no consensus on the sensitivity of the climate, "which is why, despite 17 years of dramatic increases in carbon production by humans, surface temperatures (on) the Earth have stabilized."

"The president's come out with rules that say 'no new coal-fired power plants,' " [Shelley Moore Capito] says. "But what he's going to come out with in the next several months is you're not even going to be able to burn coal very limitedly in the existing plants."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

We're looking back at 10 recent fact-checks from PolitiFact and PunditFact on climate change in light of the U.N. summit in New York last week. These fact-checks cover some of the key points of the climate change debate.

1."Climate change is a hoax."

Earlier this year we looked at a detailed video from Louisiana congressional candidate Lenar Whitney, who repeated the assertion that climate change is a hoax. We found - as we have before - that there's an overwhelming consensus among respected scientists that human-caused global warming is real. In this fact-check, we looked at some of Whitney's supporting evidence to argue that global warming is a hoax and found that it was weak. We rated her statement Pants on Fire.

2. The United States is the leading nation in the world "with the highest amount of doubt about the conventional wisdom of climate change."

Talk show host Rush Limbaugh says he doesn't believe in climate change, and he gives himself the credit for convincing others of the same. Recent reports showed the United States is the leading nation in the world "with the highest amount of doubt about the conventional wisdom of climate change," Limbaugh said in July.

Aside from Limbaugh's bragging, PunditFact looked at recent studies on global opinions on health care. We found that a good proportion of developing countries have higher rates of doubt than the United States. But among its peers, the United States is one of the most - if not, the most - skeptical when it comes to believing climate change has human factors. So we rated Limbaugh's statement Mostly True.

3. "Virtually no Republican" in Washington accepts climate change science.

California is in the forefront of regulations to address carbon emissions that are causing climate change. Gov. Jerry Brown said that's in part because Washington won't act. Brown told journalist George Stephanopolous in May that "there's virtually no Republican who accepts the science that virtually is unanimous. ... There's just political denial for various reasons, best known to those people who are in denial." We found few Republicans in Congress who accept the prevailing scientific conclusion that global warming is real and man-made; we named them in our fact-check, concludingBrown's qualified statement was Mostly True.

4. Cap and trade legislation "was originally a Republican idea."

Democratic National Committee chair Debbie Wasserman Schultz also serves as a member of Congress who represents parts of South Florida. She said in May that rising sea levels and flooding will make part of her district uninhabitable in the future, and she called for Republican support on solutions, singling out a cap and trade plan as an area where the parties could agree.

"That was originally a Republican idea. It was developed in the 1970s when the Clean Air Act was initially adopted," she said.

PolitiFact Florida recapped the history of cap and trade and found she was largely correct, though it's important to note that Democrats supported cap and trade at key points. We rated her statement Mostly True.

5. Surface temperatures on Earth "have stabilized."

Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., has repeatedly questioned the need for proposals that address climate change, but he often tries to do it without sounding anti-science.

In an interview on Fox News in May, Rubio said he never denied that the climate was changing, but he also said that "the left loves to go around saying there is a consensus" when there is no consensus on the sensitivity of the climate, "which is why, despite 17 years of dramatic increases in carbon production by humans, surface temperatures (on) the Earth have stabilized."

Rubio has a point that over roughly the past 15 years, global surface temperatures have plateaued, particularly compared to their rapid rise in previous decades. But scientists we interviewed said the evidence suggests that the pause is temporary, with temperatures poised to rise once the oceans start releasing more heat. We rated Rubio's claim Mostly False.

6. "NASA scientists fudged the numbers to make 1998 the hottest year to overstate the extent of global warming."

Fox News host Steve Doocy repeated something that's been all over the Internet: the claim that scientists have fixed numbers to make 1998 the hottest year.

Scientists have adjusted historical data to account for weather stations that have moved or when temperatures were recorded at different times of day. That's hardly the same thing as fudging the numbers in pursuit of a political agenda. We rated Doocy's statement Pants on Fire.

7. New carbon regulations will increase electric bills by "$17 billion every year" and "potentially put an average of 224,000 more people out of work every year."

In June, President Barack Obama unveiled tough regulations on existing power plants to curb carbon emissions in the coming decades. On his website, House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said, "The president's plan would indeed cause a surge in electricity bills - costs stand to go up $17 billion every year. But it would also shut down plants and potentially put an average of 224,000 more people out of work every year."

Those numbers aren't correct; they were calculated for more dramatic restrictions than what the Obama administration proposed. The study's authors even said they don't apply to what the administration put forward. So we rated the statement False.

8. "What (the Obama administration is) going to come out with in the next several months is you're not even going to be able to burn coal very limitedly in the existing plants."

U.S. Rep. Shelley Moore Capito, a Republican running for Senate in West Virginia, released a campaign ad saying that Obama's regulations meant the end of burning coal in existing coal plants.

"The president's come out with rules that say 'no new coal-fired power plants,' " Capito says. "But what he's going to come out with in the next several months is you're not even going to be able to burn coal very limitedly in the existing plants."

She was referring to plans that will force cuts to carbon emissions in some existing power plants, but those rules do not prohibit the burning of coal. Experts expect coal to remain part of the national portfolio for years to come. We rated the statement False.

9. "Only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening."

Sen. Chris Murphy, D-Conn., said Republicans should come around on climate change because voters will eventually demand it. "We have to tell Republicans that if they ultimately want to stop the hemorrhaging from young voters in this country, they need to start paying attention to this issue, because only 3 percent of voters 18 to 34 don't believe that climate change is really happening," he said.

The polling on this particular question is limited, but the polling that has been done supports Murphy's carefully worded statement. We rated it True.

10."There are already more American jobs in the solar industry than in coal mining."

U.S. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse, D-R.I., delivers regular Senate speeches about the dangers of climate change and authors commentary on the topic. In May, he argued that addressing climate change makes economic sense, adding, "There are already more American jobs in the solar industry than in coal mining."

PolitiFact Rhode Island found that the most recent data from three objective sources support his claim. We rated his statement True.

Edited for print. Read the full rulings at PolitiFact.com.

Credit: PolitiFact Editor
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**ABSTRACT**

The deal marks the first time that China, the largest emitter of global-warming greenhouse gases, has pledged to curtail its emissions. And it marks a more aggressive stance by the United States, the world's second biggest carbon polluter, to curb emissions over the long term. China pledged to cap its growing emissions by no later than 2030, and set a goal of having clean energy sources like wind and solar power account for 20 percent of its energy mix. The [Barack Obama] administration, in return, accelerated its plan to cut emissions by 2025.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

The agreement between the United States and China to curb carbon emissions is a historic step toward addressing the dire threats posed by climate change. The deal sends a timely message to other industrialized states as world leaders prepare to draft a broader climate pact next year, and it should inspire the clean energy industry, which has been looking for a sign that the global community is prepared to move away from its reliance on dirty fossil fuels. The agreement hinges on mutual cooperation and a heavy dose of public faith, but it's a solid starting point that should have a positive domino effect across the globe.

The deal marks the first time that China, the largest emitter of global-warming greenhouse gases, has pledged to curtail its emissions. And it marks a more aggressive stance by the United States, the world's second biggest carbon polluter, to curb emissions over the long term. China pledged to cap its growing emissions by no later than 2030, and set a goal of having clean energy sources like wind and solar power account for 20 percent of its energy mix. The Obama administration, in return, accelerated its plan to cut emissions by 2025.

Whether the cuts actually take place remains to be seen. China is a rapidly expanding industrial power looking to broaden its grip in Asia. The Republican takeover of the Senate in the midterm elections leaves Obama facing an uphill battle to enshrine these cuts into law.

But the deal could change the dynamics of the climate debate in a substantive way. Having an agreement between two nations with opposite political systems that account for 40 percent of all global greenhouse gas emissions sets a powerful example in all camps across the globe. Developing states looking to China can see that fossil fuels are not the only way to grow their economies. Western nations can follow the U.S. lead in balancing economic and environmental concerns. Having the world's two leading economies on the same page also will send a jolt of confidence to clean energy entrepreneurs who are working to make renewable sources and conservation efforts more reliable and efficient.

China still has a long lag time to comply, which gives leader Xi Jinping breathing room. Obama has shown he intends to move forward if necessary through executive action. But the deal weakens the obstructionists on both sides by removing a need for one nation to act first. Even a modest start by the two world powers and leading economies creates a momentum of its own. Both nations also are responding to growing calls domestically for more responsible energy policies - ones that promote both jobs and public health.

The agreement testifies to the value of engaged diplomacy, and on an immediate level, it opens a generous window between now and the Paris climate summit in late 2015 for more countries to follow with pledges of their own. It is no empty exercise to raise expectations.
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Caption: PHOTO - Associated Press: President Barack Obama and Chinese President Xi Jinping pledged Wednesday to take ambitious actions to limit greenhouse gases.
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**ABSTRACT**

A reader recently sent us a meme featuring a picture of [Joe Barton] alongside the quotation, "Wind is a finite resource and harnessing it would slow the winds down which would cause the temperature to go up." The meme's creator went on to comment, "The only thing more stupid than this idiot heading the House-Senate energy conf(erence) is Michelle Bachmann's stint on the House 'Intelligence' Committee!" (Michele Bachmann's name is misspelled.)

Let's start with what was known at the time Barton made his comment six years ago. The paper ultimately referenced by Barton -- the one that [David W. Keith] coauthored -- found some intriguing interactions between wind turbines and climate, namely that "very large amounts of wind power" can produce changes to climate "at continental scales."

Jacobson agreed that even installing enough wind-power capacity to power "half the world" would have "small" global impacts on climate, even though the impacts locally could be more significant. If you weigh the negatives of wind power against the negatives of fossil-fuel use, he added, "there is only a net benefit of switching to wind."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Says. Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, once said, "Wind is a finite resource and harnessing it would slow the winds down, which would cause the temperature to go up."

- Facebook posts on Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 in a meme on social media

\* \* \*

The Ruling: MOSTLY FALSE

Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, is not popular among environmentalists. A former chairman of the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee, Barton is a staunch advocate for fossil fuels and expressed skepticism about the role of manmade carbon emissions in climate change.

Barton's critics like to paint him as blindly supportive of Big Oil and as anti-science. Exhibit A is a series of social media memes that mock him for suggesting that wind power can actually intensify global warming.

The most extreme version we found said Barton had claimed that "wind power would stop the Earth from rotating." That's clearly not true, but it's also not clear that this claim was meant to be taken seriously. Instead, we decided to check a less outrageous -- and more common -- meme mocking Barton.

A reader recently sent us a meme featuring a picture of Barton alongside the quotation, "Wind is a finite resource and harnessing it would slow the winds down which would cause the temperature to go up." The meme's creator went on to comment, "The only thing more stupid than this idiot heading the House-Senate energy conf(erence) is Michelle Bachmann's stint on the House 'Intelligence' Committee!" (Michele Bachmann's name is misspelled.)

Ultimately, we concluded that Barton's words were significantly altered.

What did Barton actually say?

As it turns out, the comments from the meme we're checking stem from a congressional hearing held almost six years ago, on Feb. 26, 2009.

As part of a lengthy question-and-answer session, Barton pressed witnesses on some of the risks of shifting the nation's energy portfolio from fossil fuels to renewable sources. In one exchange, Barton referred to a paper by Jay Apt, director of the Carnegie Mellon Electricity Industry Center and a professor of technology at the Tepper School of Business. In turn, Apt's paper relied on research in an earlier paper by David W. Keith, currently a professor of applied physics and public policy at Harvard University.

Barton's off-the-cuff comments are somewhat meandering, but the general gist of what he said was to raise questions about some of the downsides of using wind to generate electricity.

"I am going to read a paragraph which is, if true, very ironic. And this is from Dr. Apt's paper, and I quote: 'Wind energy is a finite resource. At large scale, slowing down the wind by using its energy to turn turbines has environmental consequences. A group of researchers at Princeton University ... found that wind farms may change the mixing of air near the surface, drying the soil near the site. At planetary scales, David Keith, who was then at Carnegie Mellon, and coworkers found that if wind supplied 10 percent of expected global electricity demand in 2100 ... the resulting change in the earth's atmospheric energy might cause some regions of the world to experience temperature change of approximately 1 degree Centigrade.' ...

"Now, wind is God's way of balancing heat. Wind is the way you shift heat from areas where it is hotter to areas where it is cooler. That is what wind is. Wouldn't it be ironic if in the interest of global warming we mandated massive switches to energy, which is a finite resource, which slows the winds down, which causes the temperature to go up? Now, I am not saying that is going to happen, Mr. Chairman, but that is definitely something on the massive scale. I mean, it does make some sense. You stop something. You can't transfer that heat and the heat goes up. It is just something to think about."

Reading the full text shows that the meme glossed over some important nuances, perhaps by relying on a brief summation published by Time magazine in 2010.

First, even though the meme used quotation marks to frame the comment as a single, unified quote, it's actually a stitched-together mix of several snippets from Barton's remarks.

Second, the meme ignores that when Barton said that "wind is a finite resource," he was explicitly quoting Apt's paper, rather than saying that was his personal belief.

Third, the meme overlooks that when Barton supposedly said that harnessing the wind "would slow the winds down, which would cause the temperature to go up," he was actually asking the witness a question rather than stating his view.

And fourth, the meme ignores that Barton said in the same exchange, "Now, I am not saying that is going to happen, Mr. Chairman." In other words, what he was doing was posing a scenario to be discussed further.

So, while Barton's comments clearly show an openness to the ideas he addressed, the meme is off-base in suggesting that Barton was stating his own opinion.

For the record, Barton's spokesman, Sean Brown, told PolitiFact that the congressman "believes in an all-of-the-above energy plan that includes wind and solar power but also doesn't ignore traditional sources of energy like coal or natural gas."

Is there any credibility to the idea that wind energy might contribute to global warming?

So Barton didn't say what the meme said he did. But what about the substance of the claim -- that wind turbines can exacerbate global warming?

The idea isn't entirely out of left field, but it's a lot more complicated than it seems on the surface.

Let's start with what was known at the time Barton made his comment six years ago. The paper ultimately referenced by Barton -- the one that Keith coauthored -- found some intriguing interactions between wind turbines and climate, namely that "very large amounts of wind power" can produce changes to climate "at continental scales."

However, the authors leavened this assessment with a more optimistic note -- that such changes in climate disappear at the global level, and that, on balance, using wind power rather than fossil fuels reduces climate change, rather than exacerbating it.

Keith, who didn't respond to an inquiry from PolitiFact, and his coauthors also emphasized that what negative impacts emerged from wind-turbine use could be eased, fairly economically, by better turbine design and placement.

Subsequent research has bolstered this conclusion.

A 2012 study that used satellite data for west-central Texas, published in Nature Climate Change and co-authored by Liming Zhou of the State University of New York at Albany, found a "significant warming trend" of up to 1.3 degrees Fahrenheit per decade over wind farms, compared to nearby regions that didn't have wind farms. However, Zhou told the Daily Telegraph that the climatic changes from wind farms paled when compared to the impact of manmade global warming.

And Mark Z. Jacobson, a Stanford University professor of civil and environmental engineering, told PolitiFact that a 2012 paper he coauthored found that the impact of large arrays of wind turbines would be to cool climate -- not warm it. "That paper is the most detailed to date," Jacobson said.

Jacobson agreed that even installing enough wind-power capacity to power "half the world" would have "small" global impacts on climate, even though the impacts locally could be more significant. If you weigh the negatives of wind power against the negatives of fossil-fuel use, he added, "there is only a net benefit of switching to wind."

Our ruling

A social media meme says Barton once said, "Wind is a finite resource and harnessing it would slow the winds down which would cause the temperature to go up."

Barton raised that possibility while questioning a witness during a 2009 congressional hearing, but contrary to the meme's implication, he did not say that it was his personal belief. Rather, the meme makes fun of Barton by stitching together parts of his comments in a way that is misleading.

The statement contains some element of truth but ignores critical facts that would give a different impression, so we rate it Mostly False.

\* \* \*
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**ABSTRACT**

Or more simply, the very state agency charged with protecting and nurturing the environment was barred from using terms reflecting the greatest threat to Florida's environment: "climate change," "global warming," "sustainability" and "sea level rise." [Rick Scott] might just as well have tossed in "reality," "willful ignorance" and "Luddite."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Contrary to popular misconception, especially in Tallahassee, Rick Scott isn't really the governor of Florida. He is, in fact, one of Monty Python's addled Knights Who Say "Ni!"

Really now, don't you suspect that if the first floor of the Governor's Mansion was 2 feet under water due to climate change, Scott still would be holding his hands over his ears while chanting "Wawawawawawawa," all the while insisting the flooding was the result of a heavy dew?

How else to explain recent revelations that upon Scott assuming the governorship, employees at the Department of Environmental Protection were ordered never to mention the science that dare not speak its name.

Or more simply, the very state agency charged with protecting and nurturing the environment was barred from using terms reflecting the greatest threat to Florida's environment: "climate change," "global warming," "sustainability" and "sea level rise." Scott might just as well have tossed in "reality," "willful ignorance" and "Luddite."

Banning DEP employees from using the vernacular of their jobs would be akin to Attorney General Pam Bondi excising the word "crime" in the workplace, or Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam decreeing that henceforth no one would be allowed to whisper "citrus greening."

Of course, as Tristram Korten of the Florida Center for Investigative Reporting discovered, you will not find any written official order barring the expression of climate change at the DEP, since that would have required printing the censored language. Pillars of salt to follow.

But Korten found no shortage of former DEP employees engaged in the science of protecting the environment who confirmed they had been verbally ordered by Scott's office to delete any references to climate change from their work product.

Things got so loopy that DEP agency employees were instructed to replace the phrase "sea level rise" with "nuisance flooding."

Now you might well expect this sort of dictatorial edict-making to occur in places like Turkmenistan, which was once ruled by Saparmurat Niyzov, who ordered the months of the year to be renamed after his family and outlawed lip-synching.

But this is Florida, the third-largest state with a university system that aspires to become a world-class leader in scientific research, being presided over by Scott, R-Bring Me A Shrubbery, a denier of an overwhelming number of peer-reviewed studies concluding (Shush!) is very, very real.

Days ago, Scott emerged from his Cone of Babel to deny he had attempted to muzzle DEP employees from speaking English. Ah - a conflict.

So whom do you believe? Former DEP professionals who claim the Scott administration undermined their scientific work, or a governor with a lengthy rap sheet of dissembling, fibbing and obfuscation who wouldn't give you a straight answer if you asked him where did Abraham Lincoln deliver the Gettysburg Address?

Scott delivered his Hummana-hummana-hummana response to the DEP flap while visiting Hialeah, which was the first time reporters had a chance to ask him questions since he ducked out a back door rather than respond to scribblers after his State of the State address last week before the start of the legislative session. Good grief, this guy spends more time on the run than The Fugitive's Richard Kimble.

Once again the artful dodger refused to say whether he believes if global warming is real, accepts mankind's contribution to the problem, or outline what the DEP is doing to combat its impact on a vulnerable peninsula.

Just what Scott hoped to accomplish by suppressing state employees charged with safeguarding the environment from merely using factual language to describe the climate challenges confronting Florida isn't entirely clear - or rational.

Perhaps it was merely a ham-handed, sloppy air-kiss sop to Scott's tea party acolytes, who somehow have accomplished the Gordian knot delusion that objective, empirically scientifically validated climate change is linked to dreaded liberal ideology. Man-made climate change = socialism?

You could probably make a modest argument that the body politic doesn't demand all that much literacy from their elected officials. Expecting the governor to acknowledge established science and avoid banning the state agency mandated to protect the environment from using accepted terms is a low bar to clear.

But this is Florida, a state at great risk from the chilling side effects of semantic chicanery.

- druth@tampabay.com
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**ABSTRACT**

[Rick Scott] has denied news reports that Department of Environmental Protection employees were barred from using the terms "climate change," "global warming" and "sustainability," but he has declined to discuss the subject in detail.

"I used 'climate change,'" [Jeff Clemens] said, "but I'm suggesting that maybe as a state we use the term 'atmospheric re-employment.' That might be something that the governor could get behind."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Gov. Rick Scott's chief of emergency management testified Thursday before the Legislature and had a half dozen chances to use the term "climate change."

But Bryan Koon would not say the C words.

Scott has denied news reports that Department of Environmental Protection employees were barred from using the terms "climate change," "global warming" and "sustainability," but he has declined to discuss the subject in detail.

In a televised hearing before a Senate budget subcommittee, Koon was talking about his agency's request for federal funds to improve emergency life safety notifications for residents and visitors in advance of floods, tornadoes and hurricanes in Florida. Sen. Jeff Clemens, D-Lake Worth, asked Koon if it's true that states need to have "climate change plans" to qualify for that federal money.

Yes, Koon replied, referring to "language to that effect."

"I used 'climate change,'" Clemens said, "but I'm suggesting that maybe as a state we use the term 'atmospheric re-employment.' That might be something that the governor could get behind."

Senators roared with laughter, and the chairman, Sen. Jack Latvala, R-Clearwater, almost literally fell out of his chair.

Koon said Clemens was right and the state's next hurricane mitigation plan, due in 2018, must include "language discussing that issue."

"What issue is that?" Clemens asked.

"The issue you mentioned earlier," Koon replied.

Credit: TIMES/HERALD TALLAHASSEE BUREAU
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Caption: PHOTO: Bryan Koon is Florida's chief of emergency management.
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**ABSTRACT**

By midcentury, between $66 billion and $106 billion worth of property will likely be below sea level nationwide, a figure that rises to a half-trillion dollars by the end of the century. The Southeast would be one of the hardest-hit regions; some parts would be so "unbearably hot" that workers would be forced indoors, cutting productivity, while some homes threatened by rising seas "could quite literally be under water" before their 30-year mortgages are paid.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

An alarming new report puts the impact of climate change in the stark terms that many skeptics might appreciate. By midcentury, the study found, tens of billions of dollars worth of property could be below sea level, while rising temperatures could devastate agricultural crops and spawn heat waves that force workers indoors and put the poor, sick and elderly at risk of medical emergencies. These findings should be a wake-up call to Gov. Rick Scott and other Florida leaders to change direction and shore up the state's defenses.

The report by a bipartisan group of leaders in politics and business, including former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and former Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson, seeks for the first time to quantify the financial impact of climate change across every region of the country. Its purpose is to try to bridge the partisan debate over global warming by framing in clear financial terms the risks of inaction to property, industry and public health.

In the short term, the report estimates, higher sea levels caused by warming likely will increase the annual cost of storms along the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico by up to $3.5 billion. Crop yields in the South and Midwest could drop 10 percent, while new demands for cooling systems could cost homeowners and businesses up to an additional $12 billion per year.

By midcentury, between $66 billion and $106 billion worth of property will likely be below sea level nationwide, a figure that rises to a half-trillion dollars by the end of the century. The Southeast would be one of the hardest-hit regions; some parts would be so "unbearably hot" that workers would be forced indoors, cutting productivity, while some homes threatened by rising seas "could quite literally be under water" before their 30-year mortgages are paid.

In Florida, rising seas that breach the porous limestone could put up to $23 billion worth of property underwater by 2050, the report estimated, a figure that grows to $208 billion by the end of the century. And the heavily urbanized Tampa Bay area would suffer some of the highest summer temperatures in the Southeast, putting more people at risk of heat-related deaths.

These findings by a group of longtime leaders from both major political parties, including former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Donna Shalala, a former U.S. Health and Human Services secretary, should force state and local governments to show more urgency in addressing climate-related impacts, from working to curb development along the coasts and protecting wetlands to developing cleaner energy sources and hardening public works.

Floridians should insist that the governor, who has long questioned whether climate change is real, start investing the financial resources that communities and homeowners need to deal with rising seas in a low-lying coastal state. Scott may not want to hear it, but he has a responsibility as governor to put lives and property over his obsession with partisan appeals to climate change skeptics.
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**ABSTRACT**

"The fact is that climate is changing faster than our efforts to address it," [Barack Obama] said in a speech on Sept. 1. "We're not acting fast enough."

In his speech, Obama also slammed "the critics and the cynics and the deniers" of climate change, saying, "Those who want to ignore the science, they are increasingly alone. They're on their own shrinking island."

[Rick Santorum]'s numbers are not made up, but his claim commits "two orders of mischaracterization," an expert said. He uses a blog's flawed analysis of a survey (and misquotes what it's allegedly disapproving). The survey actually supports the idea of scientific consensus on climate change, its lead author told us. We rated his claim False.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

President Barack Obama hiked up a melting Alaskan glacier on Tuesday as part of a weeklong trip to surmount an arguably more difficult task: getting the world to act climate change.

"The fact is that climate is changing faster than our efforts to address it," Obama said in a speech on Sept. 1. "We're not acting fast enough."

But some environmentalists are saying the visit is contradictory, if not downright hypocritical. After all, less than a month ago, Obama gave Shell the okay to drill for oil on Alaska's coast.

Progressive activist group Credo Action annotated a White House video promoting the Alaska trip. In its video, Credo says the Obama administration is "proposing to mine another 10 billion tons of Wyoming coal, which would unleash three times more carbon pollution than Obama's Clean Power Plan would even save through 2030."

We rated the claim Mostly False. A Credo spokesperson said its source is a 2015 report by Greenpeace, another environmental activist group.

Burning 10 billion tons of coal over would unleash more carbon pollution than the federal clean energy regulations expect to save over the next 15 years.

However, there is no plan to mine for 10 billion new tons of coal. Greenpeace -- and others who have quoted this figure -- are distorting a single line buried in a, 3,000-page report. The figure refers to an estimate -- developed solely for analysis -- of the maximum amount of coal that could be available for mining in a particular region of Wyoming over the next 20 years.

In his speech, Obama also slammed "the critics and the cynics and the deniers" of climate change, saying, "Those who want to ignore the science, they are increasingly alone. They're on their own shrinking island."

Republican presidential hopeful Rick Santorum, who has repeatedly called climate change "a hoax," would beg to differ. In a Aug. 28 appearance on HBO's Real Time with Bill Maher, Santorum argued he's not alone.

"The most recent survey of climate scientists said about 57 percent don't agree with the idea that 95 percent of the change in the climate is caused by CO2," he said.

"Rick, I don't know what ass you're pulling that out of," Maher retorted.

Santorum's numbers are not made up, but his claim commits "two orders of mischaracterization," an expert said. He uses a blog's flawed analysis of a survey (and misquotes what it's allegedly disapproving). The survey actually supports the idea of scientific consensus on climate change, its lead author told us. We rated his claim False.

Santorum's other claim on scientific consensus also received a False rating. He said the claim that 97 percent of scientists believe climate change is man-made - a figure cited by Obama - was debunked by the "head" of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

"The head of the UN IPC (sic) said that number was pulled out of thin air. It was based on a survey of 77 scientists," he said. "Not even 97 scientists responded to that survey."

The claim confuses several points. First, the critic of the figure he's referring to isn't the "head" of the IPCC, but an economist who worked on the IPCC's fifth report.

Second, the 97 percent doesn't come from one specific survey - it appears in at least three. And finally, the study Santorum describes isn't the one the economist objects to.The economist takes issue with with the methodology of a different survey of over 1,300 climate change studies, but he says he has "very little reason to doubt that the consensus is indeed correct."

\* \* \*
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Caption: PHOTO - NEW YORK TIMES: President Barack Obama speaks to reporters during a hike at Exit Glacier in Alaska, Sept. 1, 2015.
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**ABSTRACT**

The study found that Tampa's chances of such a rare but severely catastrophic storm will increase by three to far more than 10 times this century because of climate change. Such a hurricane would bring a storm surge of 20 feet and in one case, 36 feet. Their study didn't even account for any effects from sea level rise.

No one can adequately prepare in advance for a storm surge of 36 feet. But you can hope to prevent it. And that's why action on the climate - think carbon tax, think serious focus on renewable energy sources - is important. The simulations also included destructive but not worst-case hurricanes that aren't nearly so rare. It found that storms with 10 feet of storm surge - roughly akin to the 1921 hurricane that hit Tampa Bay - are 100-year events, and even a slight change in the model could make it a 60-year event.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Climate change is real, and its effect on hurricanes - their frequency and their severity - is no longer a distant concern but one that Tampa Bay must face now. This is bad news for a region whose drainage and sewage systems have been overwhelmed this summer by heavy rains. Just imagine what would happen during even a low-level hurricane.

Several new serious scientific studies point out what's coming, from rising oceans to worsening hurricanes. Now is the time to force politicians to face reality, to reduce carbon pollution and to prepare the Tampa Bay area - its coasts, its sea walls and its infrastructure - for seas that will rise and storms that will worsen.

Gov. Rick Scott, whose mansion in Naples is 1 foot above sea level (for now), should be leading on this issue, not pretending it doesn't exist. And the Florida congressional delegation, never mind most of the presidential candidates, are proposing little to nothing to lessen the impact of climate change and serious storms.

MIT and Princeton researchers published a paper this week that combined hurricane computer models with solid science on climate change and ran thousands of simulations. Tampa was one of three cities across the globe that was studied. And the news from thousands of computer simulations is bad. The researchers looked for so-called "gray swan" events, worst-case scenarios that are quite uncommon but will happen once in a long while.

The study found that Tampa's chances of such a rare but severely catastrophic storm will increase by three to far more than 10 times this century because of climate change. Such a hurricane would bring a storm surge of 20 feet and in one case, 36 feet. Their study didn't even account for any effects from sea level rise.

No one can adequately prepare in advance for a storm surge of 36 feet. But you can hope to prevent it. And that's why action on the climate - think carbon tax, think serious focus on renewable energy sources - is important. The simulations also included destructive but not worst-case hurricanes that aren't nearly so rare. It found that storms with 10 feet of storm surge - roughly akin to the 1921 hurricane that hit Tampa Bay - are 100-year events, and even a slight change in the model could make it a 60-year event.

NASA has looked at sea level rise, just releasing several satellite observations spanning the past quarter-century. The data show that the oceans have risen 2.5 inches on average and up to 9 inches in places - more than expected. As the oceans warm and the ice shelves melt into the sea, the problem will only accelerate.

Combine these and other studies based on actual science and statistics, not Googling and cherry-picking "sources," and reasonable people are left with a load of worry. It's time for our leaders to get nervous, too, and to act now with an eye toward the long-term future of Florida.
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**ABSTRACT**
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**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Says "the cascading effects" of climate change contributed to the rise of ISIS.

- Martin O'Malley on Thursday, September 10th, 2015 in interview with Democracy Now!

\* \* \*

THE RULING: MOSTLY TRUE

"Absurd," "embarrassing," and "brazenly silly" were some of the insults hurled at Democratic presidential candidate Martin O'Malley when he suggested in July that climate change contributed to the rise of ISIS. Despite the derision, the former governor of Maryland continues to stand by his talking point.

"One of the things that preceded the failure of the nation-state of Syria and the rise of ISIS was the effect of climate change and the mega-drought that affected that region, wiped out farmers, drove people to cities, created a humanitarian crisis," O'Malley told Bloomberg TV on July 20.

Two months later, O'Malley repeated his argument in an interview with the progressive radio show Democracy Now! on Sept. 10: "Their government could not take care of the basic needs of families in those conditions. Civil war rose up as a result of protest and repression ... then the vacuum to that led to ISIS. So these are the cascading effects that happen in a world that's very, very connected and in a world where climate change is now creating extreme weather conditions, prolonged droughts."

With recent events -- the pope's visit highlighting climate change and the United States' decision to accept more Syrian refugees -- converging on the topic, we were curious if O'Malley's claim really was "absurd."

O'Malley's source

A spokesperson for the O'Malley campaign told us that his source was a March 2015 study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. The study, which was well received in its field, does not mention ISIS at all, but its authors told us O'Malley's extrapolation makes sense.

The study found evidence that climate change led to an extreme drought in Syria's breadbasket between 2006 to 2009. Food prices skyrocketed, nutrition-related diseases became widespread, and 1.5 million internal refugees abandoned their farms and flooded into Syrian cities already crowded with 1.5 million Iraqi refugees displaced by the Iraq war, according to the study.

This influx of people exacerbated existing problems like unemployment, corruption and brewing discontent with the regime of Bashar al-Assad, which failed to respond to the situation, according to the study. In 2011, the unrest reached boiling point and erupted into the Syrian uprising.

If we follow the sequence of events like O'Malley does, it's reasonable to say the next fallen domino is the rise of ISIS.

"Once the war had begun all sorts of pre-existing actors took advantage of the situation to pursue their goals -- ISIS was one and the collapse of Syria provided fertile ground for their actions," said co-author Richard Seager, a professor of climatology at Columbia University.

O'Malley's campaign also forwarded us many reports and comments from the Department of Defense linking climate change and ISIS. We should also note that the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences study is not the first rigorous, academic investigation into the links between climate change and conflict (there's at least one other on the Syrian conflict alone).

Drought's not the sole culprit

In the grander scheme of things, experts say, the drought was just one of many sparks that set the Syrian powder keg ablaze. But both the study and O'Malley acknowledge that and get credit for not overstating climate change's impact.

While climate change may have played an indirect role in the Syrian uprising and ISIS' rise, other causes - Assad's recruitment of al-Qaeda members, the genocide against Sunni Arabs, etc.- are direct and "crystal clear," according to Ali Khedery, a former special assistant to five American ambassadors in Iraq.

Michael Doran, a senior fellow on Middle East security issues at the Hudson Institute, a conservative think tank, pointed out that unrest in region is not confined to areas suffering from drought. He, however, said that O'Malley's correct that the drought played a role in generating disaffection.

"The drought did not cause the Syrian revolution or the fall of Assad," said Kenneth Pollack, a senior fellow on Middle East policy at the Brookings Institution. "A very complex mix of factors did that, but the study suggests that climate change was part of that mix even if we can't tell how important it was."

The study, which Pollack said is garnering a lot of attention among Middle East experts, notes that there is no single cause for conflict, while O'Malley emphasized the "cascading effects" of the drought, rather than the drought itself.

"It's fair to say the uprising was going to happen at some point. But the drought did happen when it happened and based on the timing of it, the agricultural collapse and the migration were direct results," said study lead author Colin Kelley, a climatologist at the University of California at Santa Barbara. "The drought creating this chaotic situation also created better opportunity for ISIS to thrive. If you say that in the way (O'Malley) said, it's fair to argue."

Our ruling

O'Malley argued that "the cascading effects" of climate change contributed to the rise of ISIS

The O'Malley campaign referred us to a credible March 2015 study that supports his point. According to the study, a drought in Syria in the 2000s displaced millions of refugees and added to discontent that eventually erupted into war. While the study does not mention ISIS by name, the authors say O'Malley is simply taking their argument one step further.

Experts agreed that the drought, spurred by climate change, was one of many factors that led to the Syrian conflict. O'Malley's phrasing suggests he understands this and is careful not the overstate it.

We rate his claim Mostly True.

\* \* \*

About this statement:

Published: Wednesday, September 23rd, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.

Researched by: Linda Qiu

Edited by: Aaron Sharockman

Subjects: Climate Change, Environment, Foreign Policy, Terrorism

Sources: Democracy Now!, "Martin O'Malley: Climate Change Helped Spark Destabilization of Syria, Rise of Islamic State," Sept. 10, 2015; Youtube, Martin O'Malley: Climate Change Created ISIS, July 20, 2015; Email interview with Stephen Lassiter, foreign policy director for O'Malley for President, Sept. 18, 2015; Proceedings from the National Academy, "Climate change in the Fertile Crescent and implications of the recent Syrian drought," March 2, 2015; Phone interview with Colin Kelley, researcher at the University of California Santa Barbara, Sept. 21, 2015; Email interview with Richard Seager, a professor of climatology at Columbia University, Sept. 21, 2015; Email interview with Ali Khedery, chairman of Dragoman Partners, Sept. 21, 2015; Email interview with Michael Doran, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, Sept. 18, 2015; Email interview with Kenneth Pollack, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Sept. 21, 2015; Email interview with Andrew Solow, senior scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Sept. 21, 2015; Fox News, "RNC rips O'Malley for linking rise of ISIS to climate change," July 21, 2015; NewsBusters, "Press Loved O'Malley's 'Climate Change Plan' in June, Ignores His Linking It to the Rise of ISIS Now," July 21, 2015; Free Beacon, "O'Malley Blames Climate Change for Rise of Islamic State," July 21, 2015; Washington Post, "O'Malley: Climate change helped create ISIS," July 21, 2015; The Atlantic, "A Link Between Climate Change and ISIS Isn't Crazy," July 22, 2015; National Geographic, "Climate Change Helped Spark Syrian War, Study Says," March 2, 2015; New York Times, "Researchers Link Syrian Conflict to a Drought Made Worse by Climate Change," March 2, 2015; The Guardian, "How Isis came to be," Aug. 22, 2014; American Meteorological Society, "Water, Drought, Climate Change, and Conflict in Syria," Feb. 3, 2014; The Center for Climate and Security, "The Arab Spring and Climate Change," Feb. 2013

Credit: TAMPA BAY TIMES

**Illustration**

Caption: PHOTO (2) PHOTO - Reuters: A man inspects parched fields in Raqqa province, Syria, in 2010.
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**ABSTRACT**

Our community (Tampa Bay) is one of the 10 most threatened by the sea level rise in the world." - Sierra Club on Monday, February 22nd, 2016 in a letter from Tampa Bay Group chairman Kent Bailey to Hillsborough County commissioners\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEThe head of Tampa Bay's Sierra Club chapter warned the Hillsborough County Commission that building more roads will only make global warming's consequences worse for the entire region.Chapter chairman Kent Bailey told commissioners in a Feb. 22, 2016, letter that the Sierra Club would not be supporting a proposed half-cent transportation sales tax referendum known as Go Hillsborough.Bailey said the measure doesn't set aside enough money to pay for expanding mass transit. He argued that adding more roads and more cars to an already congested system will only make matters worse by increasing carbon pollution."Our community is one of the 10 most threatened by the sea level rise in the world," Bailey wrote. He added that the Tampa Bay area will be among the first to suffer from flooding caused by climate change.There's no doubt the oceans are rising, and Tampa Bay will feel the effects. But is the region among the most endangered in the world? Let's just say that we found the bay area has a lot to lose.---Flooding vs. sea level riseThere are a bunch of ways to measure how climate change will affect the world's cities. People will be displaced, economies will be ruined, or you may end up with not enough water (or too much). These are all issues Tampa Bay faces, so buckle up.When we asked Bailey how he came up with his ranking, he said he was referring to potential property losses, mostly in terms of real estate."We can move our people. But our fixed assets are a different story," he said.He cited several sources, including a report from global-warming researchers Climate Central, and a Scientific American article that said St. Petersburg was in particular danger from sea level rise. He also pointed to a 2008 paper from the international Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The study focused on the effects of climate extremes on port cities - particularly storm surge.Coastal flooding is different than sea level rise, but experts told us Bailey is using a fair benchmark for comparison. Vulnerability to storm surge and sea level rise often are conflated in discussions on climate change, they said."They are related, but not exactly the same," said Ben Strauss, vice president for sea level and climate impacts at Climate Central. In general, sea level rise can make a big impact on flooding, and will assuredly make storm surges and flooding worse in the future.David Hastings, a marine science professor at Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, said storm surges are especially dangerous in Tampa and St. Petersburg because of the relatively shallow offshore shelf in the Gulf of Mexico. Higher sea levels will make surges even more dangerous.But back to the OECD study: Economists examined 136 port cities and found that Tampa and St.
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"Our community (Tampa Bay) is one of the 10 most threatened by the sea level rise in the world." - Sierra Club on Monday, February 22nd, 2016 in a letter from Tampa Bay Group chairman Kent Bailey to Hillsborough County commissioners\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEThe head of Tampa Bay's Sierra Club chapter warned the Hillsborough County Commission that building more roads will only make global warming's consequences worse for the entire region.Chapter chairman Kent Bailey told commissioners in a Feb. 22, 2016, letter that the Sierra Club would not be supporting a proposed half-cent transportation sales tax referendum known as Go Hillsborough.Bailey said the measure doesn't set aside enough money to pay for expanding mass transit. He argued that adding more roads and more cars to an already congested system will only make matters worse by increasing carbon pollution."Our community is one of the 10 most threatened by the sea level rise in the world," Bailey wrote. He added that the Tampa Bay area will be among the first to suffer from flooding caused by climate change.There's no doubt the oceans are rising, and Tampa Bay will feel the effects. But is the region among the most endangered in the world? Let's just say that we found the bay area has a lot to lose.---Flooding vs. sea level riseThere are a bunch of ways to measure how climate change will affect the world's cities. People will be displaced, economies will be ruined, or you may end up with not enough water (or too much). These are all issues Tampa Bay faces, so buckle up.When we asked Bailey how he came up with his ranking, he said he was referring to potential property losses, mostly in terms of real estate."We can move our people. But our fixed assets are a different story," he said.He cited several sources, including a report from global-warming researchers Climate Central, and a Scientific American article that said St. Petersburg was in particular danger from sea level rise. He also pointed to a 2008 paper from the international Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The study focused on the effects of climate extremes on port cities - particularly storm surge.Coastal flooding is different than sea level rise, but experts told us Bailey is using a fair benchmark for comparison. Vulnerability to storm surge and sea level rise often are conflated in discussions on climate change, they said."They are related, but not exactly the same," said Ben Strauss, vice president for sea level and climate impacts at Climate Central. In general, sea level rise can make a big impact on flooding, and will assuredly make storm surges and flooding worse in the future.David Hastings, a marine science professor at Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, said storm surges are especially dangerous in Tampa and St. Petersburg because of the relatively shallow offshore shelf in the Gulf of Mexico. Higher sea levels will make surges even more dangerous.But back to the OECD study: Economists examined 136 port cities and found that Tampa and St. Petersburg together were among the 10 cities with the most property at risk to wind damage and coastal flooding from storm surge. And that's for right now, let alone after sea levels increase."The top 10 cities in terms of assets exposed are Miami, Greater New York, New Orleans, Osaka-Kobe, Tokyo, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Nagoya, Tampa-St. Petersburg and Virginia Beach," the paper read. Those rankings could get better if steps were taken to mitigate flooding, the study said. But they could also get worse, as cities grow and gain more people. The effects of subsidence (the physical earth below the city changing or sinking, which is a major issue in Tampa Bay) and the changing climate could magnify the risk, too.Many of the same economists revisited the rankings in a 2013 study published in the journal Nature Climate Change. Tampa-St. Petersburg came in as the seventh-most at risk of flooding.If you're looking for a price tag for how much Tampa Bay stands to lose, the OECD has one: In a catastrophic, once-in-100-years flood, losses to the region currently could be $49.6 billion.University of South Florida oceanography professor Gary Mitchum noted real estate losses are only part of the story. As the oceans rise permanently, the region's tourism-based economy will suffer extensively. Many people who can afford to simply move away probably will, but low-wage workers dependent on disappearing service industry jobs will be stuck.Of course, the region's property loss ranking may change some as population, planning and even geography shift. But these are from economists, considering economic impact. If we examined this another way - say, how many people will be permanently displaced by the eventual coastal floods that won't recede - other places will have it much worse than Tampa Bay.Even the OECD researchers said their rankings would be different by that measure. Cities in China and southeast Asian countries, like Bangladesh and Vietnam, will be much more affected that way. It's much harder to quantify how the human toll will affect regions because you can't easily attach a dollar amount to it."The social impact of this is much more complicated," Mitchum said. "The result that you get depends on how you assess it."---Our rulingSierra Club's Bailey said, "Our community (Tampa Bay) is one of the 10 most threatened by the sea level rise in the world."He cited credible research that showed the region is among the most at risk of property damage from coastal flooding. He's conflating that research with the effects of sea level rise, but several experts told us the problems are related.It's striking that Tampa Bay is already in great danger when it comes to potential property loss, but Bailey should have been more specific. There are other ways to measure the consequences of rising oceans beyond real estate. When we consider some of these factors, other major cities could be considered worse off than Tampa Bay.The statement is accurate but needs clarification. We rate it Mostly True.\* \* \*About this statement:Published: Friday, February 26th, 2016 at 2:24 p.m.Researched by: Joshua GillinEdited by: Katie SandersSubjects: Climate Change, TransportationSources:Kent Bailey, Letter from Tampa Bay Sierra Club to Hillsborough County commissioners, Feb. 22, 2016Tampa Bay Times Bay Buzz blog, "Sierra Club to Commissioners: Go Hillsborough needs more transit funding," Feb. 22, 2016OECD iLibrary, "Ranking Port Cities with High Exposure and Vulnerability to Climate Extremes," November 2008OECD iLibrary, "Ranking Port Cities with High Exposure and Vulnerability to Climate Extremes abstract," November 2008Scientific American, "Scientists Seek Strategy to Convey Seriousness of Sea-Level Rise," Sept. 10, 2012WUSF, "Rising Sea Levels: How Much of Tampa Bay Would Be Under Water?," Jan. 22, 2013Climate Central, "Cities Below Future Seas," July 29, 2013247WallSt.com, "Seven Cities at Risk of Rising Seas," Aug. 12, 2013Globe and Mail, "Vancouver near top of list of cities threatened by rising sea levels," Aug. 20, 2013Nature Climate Change, "Future flood losses in major coastal cities," September 2013Nature Climate Change, "Future flood losses in major coastal cities abstract," September 2013Tampa Bay Times, "Impact of climate change on Florida economy could be huge," May 7, 2014Florida Water and Climate Alliance, "Seeing Beyond Sea Level Rise: Visualizing Local Climate Change in Tampa Bay," November 2014Tampa Bay Times, "'Climate change' ban boosts Florida's image as the Punchline State," March 12, 2015Karen Clark &Co., "Most Vulnerable US Cities to Storm Surge Flooding," August 2015Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, "Carbon choices determine US cities committed to futures below sea level," Sept. 18, 2015Statista.com, "The cities most threatened by rising sea levels," Nov. 23, 2015Washington Post, "Seas are now rising faster than they have in 2,800 years, scientists say," Feb. 22, 2016Climate Central, "The Human Fingerprints on Coastal Floods," Feb. 22, 2016Mashable.com, "The American cities most threatened by rising sea levels," Oct. 12, 2015Washington Post (via Tampa Bay Times), "This is how rising sea levels will reshape the face of the Tampa Bay area," Oct. 14, 2015Interview with David Hastings, Eckerd College marine science professor, Feb. 22-23, 2016Interview with Gary Mitchum, University of South Florida oceanography professor, Feb. 22-23, 2016Interview with Ben Strauss, Climate Central vice president for sea level and climate impacts, Feb. 22-23, 2016Interview with Maya Burke, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council senior environmental planner, Feb. 22, 2016Interview with Nicholas Keyes, World Bank group spokesman, Feb. 23, 2016Interview with Kent Bailey, Tampa Bay Group Sierra Club chairman, Feb. 23-24, 2016Interview with Robert Nicholls, University of Southampton coastal engineering professor, Feb. 26, 2016
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Caption: PHOTO - TAMPA BAY TIMES: A jet skier uses Bayshore Boulevard in Tampa after winds and storm surge flooded the street in 2004. PHOTO (2)
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**ABSTRACT**

There is not a single candidate in the Republican primary that thinks we should do anything about climate change." - Barack Obama on Tuesday, February 16th, 2016 in a press conference\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEForeign leaders are "troubled" by some of the rhetoric coming out of the Republican presidential primary, and it's not just what they're hearing from Donald Trump, says President Barack Obama."But this is not just Mr. Trump. Look at the statements that are being made by the other candidates," Obama said at a Feb. 16 news conference. "There is not a single candidate in the Republican primary that thinks we should do anything about climate change, that thinks it's serious. Well, that's a problem. The rest of the world looks at that and says, how can that be?"Obama's statement sounded similar to a take from Democratic presidential candidate Sen. Bernie Sanders, who recently said, "Not one Republican has the guts to recognize that climate change is real." We rated that claim False because a couple GOP presidential candidates (including some who are no longer in the running) have acknowledged its existence.Obama's claim is different: He said none of the Republicans thinks the country should do anything about climate change.To different degrees, the remaining candidates don't believe man-made climate change is happening, or at least not to the extent that Obama and a vast majority of climate scientists believe it's happening.All of the Republican candidates - Donald Trump, Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz, John Kasich and Ben Carson - call for scaling back environmental and energy regulations. Some support going through the private sector for renewable energy source development, alongside continued development of fossil fuels, and environmental protection.But none have a fleshed-out plan to specifically address the issue of climate change.Here's where the remaining Republican presidential candidates stand on climate change and what they propose to do (or not do) about it.---Donald TrumpTrump has said repeatedly that he does not believe in climate change, even suggesting it's a conspiracy invented by China to make the United States less competitive.His website doesn't have any information on his plans to combat climate change or how he would approach energy issues. He has said he would abolish the Environmental Protection Agency, and the environment will be "fine."When MSNBC's Joe Scarborough asked Trump in November what he would do about climate change, Trump did not outline a specific plan, but he said, "We want to have clean air to breathe and we want to have beautiful clean water. That's very important to me."---Sen.
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"There is not a single candidate in the Republican primary that thinks we should do anything about climate change." - Barack Obama on Tuesday, February 16th, 2016 in a press conference\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEForeign leaders are "troubled" by some of the rhetoric coming out of the Republican presidential primary, and it's not just what they're hearing from Donald Trump, says President Barack Obama."But this is not just Mr. Trump. Look at the statements that are being made by the other candidates," Obama said at a Feb. 16 news conference. "There is not a single candidate in the Republican primary that thinks we should do anything about climate change, that thinks it's serious. Well, that's a problem. The rest of the world looks at that and says, how can that be?"Obama's statement sounded similar to a take from Democratic presidential candidate Sen. Bernie Sanders, who recently said, "Not one Republican has the guts to recognize that climate change is real." We rated that claim False because a couple GOP presidential candidates (including some who are no longer in the running) have acknowledged its existence.Obama's claim is different: He said none of the Republicans thinks the country should do anything about climate change.To different degrees, the remaining candidates don't believe man-made climate change is happening, or at least not to the extent that Obama and a vast majority of climate scientists believe it's happening.All of the Republican candidates - Donald Trump, Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz, John Kasich and Ben Carson - call for scaling back environmental and energy regulations. Some support going through the private sector for renewable energy source development, alongside continued development of fossil fuels, and environmental protection.But none have a fleshed-out plan to specifically address the issue of climate change.Here's where the remaining Republican presidential candidates stand on climate change and what they propose to do (or not do) about it.---Donald TrumpTrump has said repeatedly that he does not believe in climate change, even suggesting it's a conspiracy invented by China to make the United States less competitive.His website doesn't have any information on his plans to combat climate change or how he would approach energy issues. He has said he would abolish the Environmental Protection Agency, and the environment will be "fine."When MSNBC's Joe Scarborough asked Trump in November what he would do about climate change, Trump did not outline a specific plan, but he said, "We want to have clean air to breathe and we want to have beautiful clean water. That's very important to me."---Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla.Rubio believes the climate is changing, but he questions how much of it is man-made."The climate has always changed," Rubio said in January. "There's never been a time when the climate has not been changing."He has criticized international climate efforts, as well as Obama's regulatory measures, saying they are more damaging to the economy than they are helpful to the environment."If you're overly dependent on any one source of fuel, then you become vulnerable to disruption," he said at the same event in January. "I want America to truly have a truly all-of-the-above strategy."Rubio has not released a plan to quell the effects of climate change.---Sen. Ted Cruz, R-TexasCruz believes man-made climate change is not real. He has called it a "pseudoscientific theory" and has criticized Obama for calling it a major security threat.His website says he would abolish the Energy Department and eliminate at least 10 existing climate change and environmental programs.Like Rubio, he calls for an "all-of-the-above" approach to energy, meaning he supports development of fossil fuels as well as renewable resources, which he says amounts to an "energy renaissance.""We must harness our nation's energy resources and remove federal impediments to energy exploration, development and trade," he wrote.---Ben CarsonCarson does not believe in man-made climate change. He has said it's part of a natural cycle and cannot be "an excuse not to develop our own God-given natural resources."His energy plan calls for reducing government regulations on energy production, including fossil fuels that contribute to climate change, but also developing renewable fuels. He also calls on people to be stewards of the environment, but not at the expense of jobs and the economy.He did tell Time in October 2015 that if there is "clear-cut evidence" that a certain manufacturing practice is causing significant harm to the environment, President Carson might take some action."I would use the EPA to work with business industry and academia to find the cleanest, most environmentally friendly way to do things, rather than just all right, we're coming in here and we're shutting you down," he said.---Ohio Gov. John KasichAs recently as Feb. 29, Kasich has said he believes there is a climate change problem, acknowledging he is going against the grain of his party.But he has not proposed a full-fledged strategy to address it, and his fact sheet on energy does not mention climate change. He has, though called for pursuing renewable energy sources as one possible response.In August, he questioned the extent of man's impact on the environment, calling full-blown climate change "some theory that is not proven." He said he wouldn't want to destroy any jobs in order to address these concerns.---Former Florida Gov. Jeb BushBush has dropped out of the race, but we're including him because he was still in the running when Obama made his statement.He believes climate change is real and human activity is a contributing factor. He had an energy plan but not a specific environmental protection plan.He has argued that some of the Obama administration's regulations go too far, such as Obama's Clean Power Plan. Like most of the other Republican candidates, he called for reducing regulations and increasing growth in the energy sector, both fossil fuel and renewable sources."Energy resources must be developed in a way that protects human health and the environment," his energy plan said. "Rules play an important role in making sure this is the case. But the Obama administration's excessive rules too often usurp state and tribal authority and go beyond what is necessary."---Our rulingObama said, "There is not a single candidate in the Republican primary that thinks we should do anything about climate change."None of the remaining Republican presidential candidates have laid out a specific plan to address climate change. All of them call for scaling back Obama's environmental regulations, to boot.Some have called for private-sector development of renewable energy sources. Bush, who was in the race when Obama made his comment, and Kasich both have said they believe human-caused climate change is real and have said pursuing these alternative energy sources could mitigate the problem. But neither has outlined a specific plan.For some Republican voters, this stance might be a plus. But it doesn't change the veracity of Obama's statement.We rate it Mostly True.\* \* \*About this statement:Published: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 1:43 p.m.Researched by: Lauren Carroll, C. Eugene Emery Jr.Edited by: Katie SandersSubjects: Climate ChangeSources:NPR, "Where Presidential Candidates Stand On Climate Change," Aug. 11, 2015Des Moines Register, "Marco Rubio opposes climate change measures," Jan. 24, 2016Trump campaign, "Positions," accessed Feb. 18, 2016Rubio campaign, "Powering the New American Century," accessed Feb. 18, 2016Bush campaign, energy plan, accessed Feb. 18, 2016Kasich campaign, Kasich action plan, accessed Feb. 18, 2016Carson campaign, "Prescription for an American energy renaissance," accessed Feb. 20, 2016Carson campaign, "Environment - Climate Change," accessed Feb. 18, 2016Cruz campaign, "Jobs and opportunity," accessed Feb. 18, 2016Cruz campaign, "Five for freedom," accessed Feb. 18, 2016PolitiFact, "What Donald Trump said about the Chinese inventing the 'hoax' of climate change," Jan. 24, 2016PolitiFact, "Bernie Sanders offers overheated claim on where all Republicans stand on climate change," Feb. 9, 2016
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Caption: VIDEO: Meteorologist Danielle Banks discusses a new Climate Central report that claims sea level rise is occurring much faster that originally thought. (Weather Channel video) PHOTO (2)
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**ABSTRACT**

Ecology and spirituality do not conflict, they coincide, according to theologian Matthew Fox. On May 13 and 14 Fox, author of 32 books, will appear at the Metropolitan Community Church of Tampa to discuss the relationship between God and Earth. Referencing works of sages, including 13th century mystic Meister Eckhart and 20th century Catholic Thomas Merton, Fox will address current topics such as climate change. Spiritual leaders must recognize how man's actions affect the planet, then work together to ensure a better future, said Fox, 75. "Religious and spiritual people need to get on board here," Fox said. "There's been this psychologizing of religion, what Pope Francis calls the narcissism or our species. Really we are in a relationship with the Earth and the other creatures.
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Ecology and spirituality do not conflict, they coincide, according to theologian Matthew Fox. On May 13 and 14 Fox, author of 32 books, will appear at the Metropolitan Community Church of Tampa to discuss the relationship between God and Earth. Referencing works of sages, including 13th century mystic Meister Eckhart and 20th century Catholic Thomas Merton, Fox will address current topics such as climate change. Spiritual leaders must recognize how man's actions affect the planet, then work together to ensure a better future, said Fox, 75. "Religious and spiritual people need to get on board here," Fox said. "There's been this psychologizing of religion, what Pope Francis calls the narcissism or our species. Really we are in a relationship with the Earth and the other creatures. This is the bigger picture. You can have your psyche perfectly in order but if you don't have water to drink or cook with, well, that's a problem." At the Tampa event, presented by the Bridge, a nonprofit organization, Fox will draw from his latest book A Way to God: Thomas Merton's Creation Spirituality Journey. The book analyzes the life and work of Merton, a pioneering Catholic monk whose writings called for contemplation and action within religious life. Merton, who died in 1968, encouraged the faithful to mind their place within creation and was a proponent of interfaith relations. Fox, who served the Dominican order for 34 years before becoming an Episcopal priest, recognizes wisdom in such voices from the past. "There have been a lot of prophets who spoke about these issues before today's headlines," Fox said. Fox teaches that positive action beneficial to others, the world and nature itself offers inner peace. "We are too busy fighting wars and imaginary wars," he said. "But if we could direct some of that energy to good works, it would be much more satisfying for everyone." Fox will lead a talk followed by a book signing from 7 to 9 p.m. May 13, and conduct a deeper workshop from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. May 14. Cost to attend is $20 for the talk, $55 for the workshop or $65 for both. Metropolitan Community Church is at 408 E Cayuga St., Tampa. For information, call (813) 416-3069 or email contact@the bridgetampa.org. To register, visit tbtim.es/108h. Contact Sarah Whitman at sarahrothwhitman@gmail.com.
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Caption: PHOTO: Matthew Fox will discuss Earth and God and how they relate.

**DETAILS**

| **Publication title:** | Tampa Bay Times; Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **First page:** | 5 |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication year:** | 2016 |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication date:** | May 6, 2016 |
| --- | --- |

| **column:** | RELIGION |
| --- | --- |

| **Section:** | TAMPA TRIBUNE |
| --- | --- |

| **Publisher:** | Times Publishing Co. |
| --- | --- |

| **Place of publication:** | Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **Country of publication:** | United States, Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication subject:** | General Interest Periodicals--United States |
| --- | --- |

| **Source type:** | Newspapers |
| --- | --- |

| **Language of publication:** | English |
| --- | --- |

| **Document type:** | News |
| --- | --- |

| **ProQuest document ID:** | 1787154279 |
| --- | --- |

| **Document URL:** | https://search.proquest.com/docview/1787154279?accountid=13360 |
| --- | --- |

| **Copyright:** | (Copyright 2016 St. Petersburg Times. All rights reserved.) |
| --- | --- |

| **Last updated:** | 2016-05-06 |
| --- | --- |

| **Database:** | Global Newsstream |
| --- | --- |

|  |
| --- |

Document 26 of 40

BERNIE SANDERS SAYS ONLY HE SUPPORTS CARBON TAX AND 'AGGRESSIVE' APPROACH TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Qiu, Linda . Tampa Bay Times ; Tampa Bay [Tampa Bay]29 May 2016.

[ProQuest document link](https://search.proquest.com/docview/1792400783?accountid=13360)



|  |
| --- |

**ABSTRACT**

I believe we should have tax on carbon and deal aggressively with climate change. That is not (Hillary Clinton's) position." - Bernie Sanders on Sunday, May 29th, 2016 in an interview on "Meet the Press"\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEBernie Sanders still doesn't want to talk about Hillary Clinton's damn emails.Asked for his reaction to the State Department report of Clinton's use of a private email server, Sanders told Meet the Press' Chuck Todd that he'd rather talk policy differences."Our campaign is about defeating Secretary Clinton on the real issues," he responded. "I want to break up the Wall Street banks. She doesn't. I want to raise the minimum wage to 15 bucks an hour. She wants $12 an hour. I voted against the war in Iraq. She voted for the war in Iraq. I believe we should ban fracking. She does not. I believe we should have tax on carbon and deal aggressively with climate change. That is not her position. Those are some of the issues that I am campaigning on."Sanders is right about Clinton's Iraq war vote and where she stands on breaking up banks, a $15 minimum wage and fracking. (For more of their policy differences, read this.) But is he also right about their differences on carbon tax and climate change?There's no doubt that Sanders' rhetoric on climate change and his plan to deal with it are aggressive and, unlike Clinton, he has advocated for a carbon tax. Clinton does, however, have a climate change plan. While some environmentalists have said it isn't tough enough, others have given it positive reviews.Both the Sanders and Clinton campaigns referred us to each candidate's climate change plan.Sanders' plan is long and comprehensive. Beyond a tax on carbon, it includes an array of proposals from banning certain drilling and mining practices to improving the national public transit system. Clinton's plan is shorter and, though it doesn't include a tax on carbon, contains similar provisions on renewables.
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"I believe we should have tax on carbon and deal aggressively with climate change. That is not (Hillary Clinton's) position." - Bernie Sanders on Sunday, May 29th, 2016 in an interview on "Meet the Press"\* \* \*The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUEBernie Sanders still doesn't want to talk about Hillary Clinton's damn emails.Asked for his reaction to the State Department report of Clinton's use of a private email server, Sanders told Meet the Press' Chuck Todd that he'd rather talk policy differences."Our campaign is about defeating Secretary Clinton on the real issues," he responded. "I want to break up the Wall Street banks. She doesn't. I want to raise the minimum wage to 15 bucks an hour. She wants $12 an hour. I voted against the war in Iraq. She voted for the war in Iraq. I believe we should ban fracking. She does not. I believe we should have tax on carbon and deal aggressively with climate change. That is not her position. Those are some of the issues that I am campaigning on."Sanders is right about Clinton's Iraq war vote and where she stands on breaking up banks, a $15 minimum wage and fracking. (For more of their policy differences, read this.) But is he also right about their differences on carbon tax and climate change?There's no doubt that Sanders' rhetoric on climate change and his plan to deal with it are aggressive and, unlike Clinton, he has advocated for a carbon tax. Clinton does, however, have a climate change plan. While some environmentalists have said it isn't tough enough, others have given it positive reviews.Both the Sanders and Clinton campaigns referred us to each candidate's climate change plan.Sanders' plan is long and comprehensive. Beyond a tax on carbon, it includes an array of proposals from banning certain drilling and mining practices to improving the national public transit system. Clinton's plan is shorter and, though it doesn't include a tax on carbon, contains similar provisions on renewables. Here's an overview:Sanders' planFOSSIL FUEL INFLUENCE- Cut tax subsidies for oil and gas companies- Prohibit fossil fuel lobbyists from working in the White House- Investigate climate change deniersENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS- Enact a tax on carbon- Ban fossil fuel leasing on public lands and promote conservation and habitat preservation- Ban Arctic oil drilling, offshore drilling, fracking, mountaintop removal coal mining and pipeline projects- Stop exports of natural gas and crude oil- Defend and close loopholes in the Clean Air Act- Increase fuel efficiency standards- Begin a moratorium on nuclear power- Create a national environmental and climate justice planRENEWABLES- Invest in clean energy infrastructure and modernize the energy grid- Invest in clean energy, alternative fuels and energy efficiency programs---Clinton's planFOSSIL FUEL INFLUENCE- Cut tax subsidies for oil and gas companiesENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS- Reform fossil fuel leasing and expand clean energy production on public lands- Defend and extend environmental standards like the Clean Power Plan- Eliminate lead poisoning, clean up brownfield sites, and create an Environmental Justice Task ForceRENEWABLES- Invest in clean energy infrastructure- Launch a $60 billion local-state-federal clean energy partnershipAs in her plan, Clinton prefers to focus on renewables on the stump. In a January Medium post responding to the Sanders camp, Clinton's campaign manager highlighted her pledge to "make America the clean energy superpower of the 21st century" in her launch speech. Clinton, who played a role in negotiating the Paris climate change agreement, herself touted her goals for more solar panel and clean electricity as "big" and "bold."Clinton has gotten her best reviews from the League of Conservation Voters, who endorsed Clinton last fall (to some controversy). The green group considers Clinton's plan strong and aggressive and, more importantly, achievable, Tiernan Sittenfeld, its senior vice president of government affairs, told PolitiFact."Hillary is focused on practical solutions," Sittenfeld said, pointing out that there are many lawmakers in Congress who still deny climate change science. "So (a carbon tax) is pretty remote possibility."But some are skeptical of Clinton's "boldness." Pulitzer Prize-winning website InsideClimate News called Clinton's plan ambitious but said it "falls short of bold." The Washington Post's editorial board said her ideas are "second best." Environmental news magazine Grist summed up her positions as not bad but "not quite the climate hawkishness we need." ---Our rulingSanders said, "I believe we should have tax on carbon and deal aggressively with climate change. That is not her position."Unlike Sanders, Clinton doesn't advocate for a carbon tax. And while Clinton doesn't go as far as Sanders in her climate change plan, she does have one. The League of Conservation Voters supports her plan as realistic and achievable. We rate Sanders' claim Mostly True.\* \* \*About this statement:Published: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 5:21 p.m.Researched by: Linda QiuEdited by: Angie Drobnic HolanSubjects: Cap and Trade, Climate Change, Energy, EnvironmentSources:NBC, Meet the Press, May 29, 2016Email interview with Warren Gunnels, policy director for Bernie Sanders, May 29, 2016Email interview with Josh Schwerin, spokesman for Hillary Clinton, May 29, 2016Bernie Sanders, "Combating Climate Change to Save the Planet," accessed May 29, 2016Hillary Clinton, "Making America the world's clean energy superpower and meeting the climate challenge," accessed May 29, 2016Interview with Tiernan Sittenfeld, senior vice president of government affairs at the League of Conservation Voters, May 29, 2016Grist, 8 things you need to know about Hillary Clinton and climate change," April 12, 2015Washington Post, "Hillary Clinton's plan to combat climate change has a glaring hole," June 30, 2015InsideClimate News, "Hillary Clinton's Climate Policy Ambitious, but Falls Short of Bold," July 27, 2015
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Caption: VIDEO: Bernie Sanders discusses his policy views on "Meet the Press." PHOTO (2)
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**ABSTRACT**

On Jan. 18, after Sanders had attacked [Donald Trump]'s climate change views in the Democratic debate, Trump told Fox &Friends, "Well, I think the climate change is just a very, very expensive form of tax. A lot of people are making a lot of money. I know much about climate change. I'd be - received environmental awards. And I often joke that this is done for the benefit of China. Obviously, I joke. But this is done for the benefit of China, because China does not do anything to help climate change. They burn everything you could burn; they couldn't care less. They have very - you know, their standards are nothing. But they - in the meantime, they can undercut us on price. So it's very hard on our business."

In a high-profile speech on energy policy in North Dakota on May 26, 2016, Trump attacked "draconian climate rules." He advocated rescinding "all the job-destroying [Obama] executive actions, including the Climate Action Plan" and said he would "cancel the Paris Climate Agreement and stop all payments of U.S. tax dollars to U.N. global warming programs."

Trump has repeatedly called climate change a "hoax" in speeches, tweets and media appearances, and while he hasn't necessarily repeated the charge that China "invented" climate change, he has said as recently as Jan. 18, 2016, that action on climate change "is done for the benefit of China."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Says "Donald Trump says climate change is a hoax invented by the Chinese."

- Hillary Clinton on Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 in a foreign policy speech

\* \* \*

The Ruling: MOSTLY TRUE

During her take-no-prisoners foreign policy speech on June 2, Hillary Clinton reminded listeners of controversial things that Republican presidential rival Donald Trump has said over the years.

At one point, Clinton said, "Donald Trump says climate change is a hoax invented by the Chinese."

Did he? Yes, though he later said it was a joke.

The original source of this claim was a tweet Trump sent on Nov. 6, 2012, as we noted in a January 2016 fact-check of a similar claim by Clinton's Democratic opponent, Bernie Sanders.

Trump's tweet said, "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive."

So Clinton certainly has evidence to support her claim. But we should also note that Trump backed off his claim after Sanders noted them in January on NBC's Meet the Press, calling the Chinese link a "joke."

On Jan. 18, after Sanders had attacked Trump's climate change views in the Democratic debate, Trump told Fox &Friends, "Well, I think the climate change is just a very, very expensive form of tax. A lot of people are making a lot of money. I know much about climate change. I'd be - received environmental awards. And I often joke that this is done for the benefit of China. Obviously, I joke. But this is done for the benefit of China, because China does not do anything to help climate change. They burn everything you could burn; they couldn't care less. They have very - you know, their standards are nothing. But they - in the meantime, they can undercut us on price. So it's very hard on our business."

Trump may call the mention of China's role a joke, but he certainly has a lengthy record of using the word "hoax" to describe climate change. (For the record, in 2014 we rated the claim that climate change is a "hoax" Pants on Fire.)

On Dec. 30, 2015, Trump told the crowd at a rally in Hilton Head, S.C., "Obama's talking about all of this with the global warming and ... a lot of it's a hoax. It's a hoax. I mean, it's a money-making industry, okay? It's a hoax, a lot of it."

That's three times using "hoax" in one sentence. Trump has also used the word on Twitter since his 2012 tweet.

On Jan. 25, 2014, Trump tweeted, "NBC News just called it the great freeze - coldest weather in years. Is our country still spending money on the GLOBAL WARMING HOAX?"

On Jan. 29, 2014, Trump tweeted: "Snowing in Texas and Louisiana, record setting freezing temperatures throughout the country and beyond. Global warming is an expensive hoax!"

That same day, he tweeted, "Give me clean, beautiful and healthy air - not the same old climate change (global warming) bullshit! I am tired of hearing this nonsense."

Trump also called climate change a "hoax" on the Jan. 6, 2014, edition of Fox &Friends.

In addition, he said on the Sept. 24, 2015, edition of CNN's New Day, "I don't believe in climate change."

And on Jan. 18, 2016, Trump said that climate change "is done for the benefit of China, because China does not do anything to help climate change."

We didn't find Trump using the word "hoax" in the months since our previous fact-check, but he hasn't backed off his aggressive skepticism of climate change and policies designed to alleviate it. In fact, he's enshrined opposition to climate change efforts as a key part of his platform.

In a high-profile speech on energy policy in North Dakota on May 26, 2016, Trump attacked "draconian climate rules." He advocated rescinding "all the job-destroying Obama executive actions, including the Climate Action Plan" and said he would "cancel the Paris Climate Agreement and stop all payments of U.S. tax dollars to U.N. global warming programs."

"President Obama entered the United States into the Paris Climate Accords unilaterally and without the permission of Congress," Trump said. "This agreement gives foreign bureaucrats control over how much energy we use right here in America."

---

Our ruling

Clinton said, "Donald Trump says climate change is a hoax invented by the Chinese."

Trump did tweet that view in 2012, though he made efforts earlier this year to describe that remark as a "joke."

However, Trump has repeatedly called climate change a "hoax" in speeches, tweets and media appearances, and while he hasn't necessarily repeated the charge that China "invented" climate change, he has said as recently as Jan. 18, 2016, that action on climate change "is done for the benefit of China."

We rate the claim Mostly True.

\* \* \*
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Caption: VIDEO: Hillary Clinton took on Donald Trump's foreign policy credentials in a speech June 2, 2016. PHOTO (6)
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**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Says Hillary Clinton "negotiated the first agreement - ever - where China and India officially committed to reduce their emissions."

- Bill Clinton on Tuesday, July 26th, 2016 in a speech at the Democratic national convention

\* \* \*

THE RULING: HALF TRUE

In detailing their much-scrutinized marriage and love story at the Democratic National Convention, former President Bill Clinton also took care to list his wife's numerous legislative and foreign policy achievements.

Among them: "She put climate change at the center of our foreign policy. She negotiated the first agreement ever - ever - where China and India officially committed to reduce their emissions."

While Bill Clinton's claim is largely accurate, he's offering a rosy spin on the Copenhagen Accord of 2009, which was at the time and continues to be widely panned.

Hillary Clinton did play a key -- but not solo -- role in the talks with China and India, and it was the first time the two countries made emissions reduction pledges in an international agreement.

But unlike the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 or Paris Agreement of 2015, the accord wasn't actually an official agreement. It wasn't "adopted" by signatories, but merely "taken note of" (in other words, they formally recognized the accord's existence).

Furthermore, the "agreement" was non-binding and the countries set their own voluntary targets, leading some environmentalists and experts to cast it aside as essentially meaningless.

Let's dive in.

Before Copenhagen, China and India had both signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol, which the United States backed out of. But because they were developing countries, they were not required to curb their carbon emissions.

In 2007, in response to overtaking the United States as the world's biggest carbon emitter, China released its first national climate change program and said it would reduce its energy consumption by 20 percent by 2010 and "consequently reduce CO2 emissions."

Similarly, India released a national action plan on climate change in 2008, in which it didn't commit to reducing emissions but laid out steps that would.

But it wasn't until Copenhagen that the two countries finally committed to reducing carbon emissions.

In this sense, the accord "played a major role in breaking" the "firewall" between developed countries and developing countries when it came to climate action responsibility, according to David Ciplet, an environmental studies professor at the University of Colorado Boulder who wrote Power in a Warming World: The New Global Politics of Climate Change and the Remaking of Environmental Inequality.

"However, whether the Copenhagen Accord was a positive development overall is definitely controversial," Ciplet told PolitiFact.

Nonetheless, like her husband, Hillary Clinton often touts the accord as one of her major climate change accomplishments, referring to it as a "key diplomatic breakthrough" on her campaign website and recounting how she and Obama were "hunting down the Chinese" to get them to the table.

She devotes a significant chunk of a chapter in her 2014 memoir, Hard Choices, to the talks. She notes the role of Todd Stern, a key negotiator, as well as her and Obama's famous tag-team chase to find the Chinese Prime Minister Wen Jiaobao during the talks.

"In a makeshift conference room whose glass walls had been covered by drapes for privacy against prying eyes, we found Wen wedged around a long table with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, and South African President Jacob Zuma. Jaws dropped when they saw us. 'Are you ready?' said President Obama, flashing a big grin," Clinton writes. "Now the real negotiations could begin. It was a moment that was at least a year in the making."

But according to news reports, world leaders, environmental activists and experts, the "real negotiations" didn't actually lead to anything with teeth. China and India did end up agreeing to reduce their emissions and set their own targets, but emphasized the pledge was not legally binding.

This basically changed the international approach to climate action from Kyoto Protocol, which had a compliance mechanism, to "a voluntary approach where countries are free to determine unilaterally what forms of action they would like to commit to," said Ciplet.

"Many, including myself, saw this as a much weaker mitigation framework than a robust second commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol," he said, adding that even after the Paris Agreement, "we are still not on track" in mitigating climate change.

Our ruling

Bill Clinton said Hillary Clinton "negotiated the first agreement - ever - where China and India officially committed to reduce their emissions."

Clinton was at the table at the Copenhagen Accord, though she wasn't the only U.S. official present. And while it was the first time China and India made pledges in an international agreement, their pledges were not legally binding.

Many, if not most, environmentalists and experts say the agreement was a wash at best and a failure at worst.

We rate Clinton's claim Half True.

\* \* \*
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**ABSTRACT**

At the same time I also see that a large number of political leaders continue to ignore the threat with such unintelligent remarks as "climate is always changing" (Sen. Marco Rubio) or "I am not a scientist" (Gov. Rick Scott). While it is frustrating to me as a scientist to hear such remarks, the reason they are made might be that scientists have not clearly explained the consequences of climate change. I don't think the political leaders who dismiss climate change understand the disastrous consequences of inaction.

Here are some quotes from his article: "An expected redistribution of infectious disease is but one of the biological consequences of global environmental change;" "but warming and increased CO2 can also stimulate microbes and their carriers;" "the emergence of new diseases like Ebola affect not only the health of individuals but also of national economies." His conclusion was that," overall, the current evaluation is that impacts of an unstable and rapidly changing climate on human health are overwhelmingly negative."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

As a scientist, I know that continuing climate change is the biggest threat to the security and prosperity of our state, our country and, indeed, the whole world. I also see the enormous economic opportunities provided by mitigating climate change.

At the same time I also see that a large number of political leaders continue to ignore the threat with such unintelligent remarks as "climate is always changing" (Sen. Marco Rubio) or "I am not a scientist" (Gov. Rick Scott). While it is frustrating to me as a scientist to hear such remarks, the reason they are made might be that scientists have not clearly explained the consequences of climate change. I don't think the political leaders who dismiss climate change understand the disastrous consequences of inaction.

This spring, Alex Sink, Florida's former chief financial officer, wrote a column for the Tampa Bay Times describing the importance of climate change to the state. I applaud her courage and vision to discuss this topic. At the same time, we continue to hear some leaders dismiss climate change, saying that even if there is some climate change it is inconsequential.

I don't believe that the political leaders who dismiss climate change are evil - they are just not educated about the consequences of climate change. Therefore, they continue to talk about the costs of actions needed to mitigate what they believe is inconsequential.

When we say that the mean global temperature will rise by a couple of degrees, the normal reaction of people would be, "So what?" and some may even say that it may be good for the colder areas. Or when we say that we will lose some coastal land because of sea level rise, many people may say that it is something that the rich who own real estate on the beaches should worry about, not them. Or when we point out that the extreme climate events in the last five years - such as sudden floods in Texas, Colorado, South Carolina, West Virginia and other states and extreme drought in California - occurred due to ongoing climate change, most people don't care because they are not personally affected.

But there is something that everyone can relate to, the biggest impact of climate change: the emergence of new microorganisms and diseases. This is something not addressed by the media. The emergence of Zika and Ebola are examples of such changes that we can relate to, especially now that Zika is threatening to be one of the biggest health threats to the people of Florida in years.

Although we can prepare to protect our people at a cost of billions of dollars, we cannot ensure that people will not get infected. While these viruses have existed in nature, even the smallest change in global temperature allows them to spread to areas where they were not known to exist before.

Scientists including professor Paul Epstein of the Harvard School of Public Health have been studying the health consequences of climate change for more than three decades and have long predicted the consequences that we are seeing now and can expect to see in the future.

Twenty years ago, as the co-editor in chief of Advances in Solar Energy with Karl Boer, I invited Epstein to write a detailed article on "The Nature and Implications of Environmental Change: Climate, Ecology and Human Health."

He predicted in that article and others some of the emerging disease agents that we are concerned about today and expect to see in the future as a direct consequence of global climate change.

Here are some quotes from his article: "An expected redistribution of infectious disease is but one of the biological consequences of global environmental change;" "but warming and increased CO2 can also stimulate microbes and their carriers;" "the emergence of new diseases like Ebola affect not only the health of individuals but also of national economies." His conclusion was that," overall, the current evaluation is that impacts of an unstable and rapidly changing climate on human health are overwhelmingly negative."

I believe it is our responsibility as citizens and the responsibility of the news media to educate people and political leaders about the disastrous consequences of inaction, especially for Florida. At the same time, I hope people understand that actions necessary to mitigate global climate change represent one of the biggest economic opportunities that we should not miss.

These opportunities include, but are not limited to, new solar and renewable energy technologies based on the vast new understanding of nano-, molecular and biotechnologies. These technologies are essential to mitigate global climate change. Years of research funded by the federal government have resulted in the development of these technologies, which present trillions of dollars of opportunities around the world. These are the technologies that will ensure continued leadership of our nation in the emerging competitive global landscape.

D. Yogi Goswami is Distinguished Professor at the University of South Florida and is the director of its Clean Energy Research Center. He is also editor in chief of the Solar Energy Journal, an international scientific journal.
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**ABSTRACT**

[Rick Scott] famously avoided answering questions about climate change by stating he's not a scientist, and his Department of Environmental Protection was ordered not to even use the term. Sen. Marco Rubio, a Miami native, has resorted to pseudo-science, acknowledging climate change by saying the climate has always been changing. But he refuses to commit to any policy fixes that could curb the calamitous effects of greenhouse gas emissions. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump represents the willfully ignorant fringe, mocking progressive leaders for sounding the alarm about climate change, which he has called a hoax. Between the presidential candidates, only Hillary Clinton takes the matter seriously. She accepts the fact that climate change is happening and is committed to addressing it through laws and technologies that create clean-energy jobs. "The science is clear," Clinton said at a campaign rally Tuesday at the University of South Florida. "It's real."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

The effects of man-made climate change, which scientists have warned about for decades, are now lapping at Florida's coastlines. In South Florida, rising sea levels are already overwhelming stormwater systems, damaging infrastructure and flooding homes. Tampa Bay can't be far behind. But local governments can do only so much to confront this global challenge. Floridians must demand that state and national leaders shed any notion that climate change can be ignored and confront the problem with urgency.

A recent New York Times report described cities along the East Coast, from Virginia to the Florida Keys, where frequent tidal flooding is no longer a distant threat. In low-lying coastal areas, the newspaper reported, "a high tide and a brisk wind are all it takes to send water pouring into streets and homes."

The ramifications are vast and varied. On the environmental front, saltwater intrusion will cause widespread damage to plants and animals, as well as drinking water. For homeowners and residents, quality of life will be harmed or they will be uprooted altogether. Some property owners who live on the water are paying to elevate their houses and seawalls. What about the millions of Floridians who can't afford those daunting expenses?

Lacking any meaningful help from Washington or Tallahassee, local governments are taxing their residents and attacking the problem neighborhood by neighborhood, intersection by intersection. In Miami Beach, workers tear up chronically flood-prone streets, raise them with extra dirt and rebuild them with added drainage capacity. The approach appears to help - until the next flood washes it all away. St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman and Tampa Mayor Bob Buckhorn have made planning for climate change part of their agendas. To do anything else would be head-in-the-sand foolish, and both mayors are well ahead of Gov. Rick Scott in confronting the inevitable.

Scott famously avoided answering questions about climate change by stating he's not a scientist, and his Department of Environmental Protection was ordered not to even use the term. Sen. Marco Rubio, a Miami native, has resorted to pseudo-science, acknowledging climate change by saying the climate has always been changing. But he refuses to commit to any policy fixes that could curb the calamitous effects of greenhouse gas emissions. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump represents the willfully ignorant fringe, mocking progressive leaders for sounding the alarm about climate change, which he has called a hoax. Between the presidential candidates, only Hillary Clinton takes the matter seriously. She accepts the fact that climate change is happening and is committed to addressing it through laws and technologies that create clean-energy jobs. "The science is clear," Clinton said at a campaign rally Tuesday at the University of South Florida. "It's real."

With more than 1,300 miles of coastline, Florida is undeniably vulnerable to the effects of swelling seas. But local, piecemeal fixes can't come close to addressing this crisis. Officials who dismiss the urgency of climate change do so at the peril of residents, businesses and natural resources. Yet instead of searching for ambitious solutions, Republican leaders in Florida dismiss the threat as a nonissue and then use it as a partisan wedge. How high will the water have to rise before Republican leaders accept this reality?
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**ABSTRACT**

The narrator continues: "[Carlos Curbelo] supports drilling offshore just like [Donald Trump], and Curbelo repeatedly voted against President [Obama]'s ability to fight pollution and combat climate change."

"They've already got plenty in the Gulf," Trump said. "It would be a little bit of a shame (to expand drilling closer to Florida), because there's so much fracking, and there's so much oil that we have now that we never thought possible. That's an issue I'd absolutely study and do the right thing."

The DCCC said,"Curbelo supports drilling offshore just like Trump and Curbelo repeatedly voted against President Obama's ability to fight pollution and combat climate change."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Says Miami Congressman Carlos "Curbelo supports drilling offshore" and "repeatedly voted against President Obama's ability to fight pollution and combat climate change."

- Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee on Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 in a TV ad

\* \* \*

The Ruling: MOSTLY FALSE

While Miami Republican Rep. Carlos Curbelo portrays himself as an environmentalist, the Democratic Party says he is no treehugger and is aligned with Donald Trump.

"Republican Carlos Curbelo and Donald Trump's ideas about the environment are more alike than you think. Curbelo talks about protecting the environment," says a TV ad by the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

The ad then shows a clip of Curbelo talking about protecting the environment and then pivots to a clip of him on an oil rig.

The narrator continues: "Curbelo supports drilling offshore just like Trump, and Curbelo repeatedly voted against President Obama's ability to fight pollution and combat climate change."

Curbelo represents a Democratic-leaning Westchester-to-Key West district. He faces a rematch Nov. 8 with former U.S. Rep. Joe Garcia, D-Miami. (Curbelo does not support Trump but said he won't vote for Hillary Clinton, either.)

We found that Curbelo supports current drilling but opposes an expansion near Florida's coasts. And while Curbelo has taken some votes related to pollution and climate change that Democrats criticize, he has been one of the more outspoken Republicans about combating climate change.

Trump on drilling

Trump has generally spoken in favor of offshore oil drilling in recent months, although his position hasn't always been clear.

He sounded skeptical about expanding offshore drilling in an interview with the Tampa Bay Times in February.

"They've already got plenty in the Gulf," Trump said. "It would be a little bit of a shame (to expand drilling closer to Florida), because there's so much fracking, and there's so much oil that we have now that we never thought possible. That's an issue I'd absolutely study and do the right thing."

But Trump has been more forceful about his support for drilling since that time.

"We're going to revoke policies that impose unwarranted restrictions on new drilling technologies," he said in North Dakota in May.

In September, Trump said in a fact sheet that he will "open up vast areas of our offshore energy resources for safe production" and will eliminate "unnecessary restrictions" on offshore oil and gas.

'Curbelo supports drilling offshore'

While Curbelo defended current offshore oil drilling in 2015, he has fought against efforts to expand it closer to Florida than the current 125-mile restriction.

Curbelo made a video of himself standing on an oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico in 2015:

"The offshore oil industry in the United States fuels about 20 percent of our economy and assets like this are an important part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will grow the American economy and make our country more secure," he said.

But Curbelo has voted three times in favor of Democratic amendments to protect coasts from drilling by banning funds, research or testing. He also got the House to pass a bill to force companies that spill oil in foreign waters to clean up any damage to Florida coasts.

'Repeatedly voted against President Obama's ability to fight pollution and combat climate change'

The Democrats point to a handful of votes that Curbelo took that were contrary to Democratic efforts to fight pollution and climate change. In all four cases, Curbelo sided with Republicans in party line votes on legislation or a resolution. But the votes are cherry-picking Curbelo's record, which also reflects his efforts to combat climate change and pollution.

o In January Curbelo took a stand along with virtually all Republicans against a controversial proposal by the federal government to define which bodies of water fall under its jurisdiction. Curbelo thought the "Waters of the United States" rule was too vague and it was later stayed by the courts.

o In 2015, Curbelo voted in favor of a bill Republicans said would prevent the EPA from using "secret science" and require transparency. The EPA argued it already is transparent and uses sound science.

o The only vote directly about climate change was minor. The House, along with Curbelo, barred funds for a government climate model program in 2015. Curbelo opposed it because he said it was duplicative, National Republican Congressional Committee spokesman Chris Pack said.

o Curbelo also voted in favor of a bill to limit environmental reviews to move projects along in 2015.

Importantly, the ad omits that Curbelo has been one of the leading Republican voices in Congress to come up with solutions to combat climate change.

In September 2015, Curbelo signed onto a congressional resolution acknowledging climate change's existence and later, along with U.S. Rep. Ted Deutch, D-Fla., formed the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus.

"It is vital for Congress to acknowledge the reality of climate change as a legitimate issue requiring feasible solutions, and we need leaders on both sides of the aisle to pursue policies that will make a difference," Curbelo wrote in an op-ed in the Miami Herald Oct. 24, 2015.

We found other actions that Curbelo took in an effort to fight pollution.

In December 2015, Curbelo was one of 10 Republicans to vote against a resolution to nullify the EPA's rules to regulate carbon emissions from new power plants.

In July 2016, Curbelo opposed a vote by a Florida commission to increase allowed levels of toxins for over two dozen known chemicals in waterways.

Our ruling

The DCCC said,"Curbelo supports drilling offshore just like Trump and Curbelo repeatedly voted against President Obama's ability to fight pollution and combat climate change."

Curbelo supports current drilling, but the ad omits that he has repeatedly voted against expanding drilling off Florida's coasts. Trump, though not always consistent, has sounded more favorable to drilling than Curbelo.

Curbelo has taken votes against Democratic efforts to curb pollution and to model climate change, but that is cherry-picking his record. The ad omits that Curbelo has been a leader among Republicans speaking out about the need to combat climate change.

We rate this claim Mostly False.

\* \* \*
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**ABSTRACT**

It's clear from who opposes and who supports Amendment 1 what is at stake. Power companies have spent more than $16 million on their campaign to restrict customer-owned solar choices, and the issue is on track to be the most heavily industry-funded ballot measure in the state's history. Their strategy is sneaky: They know that Floridians support solar and that a simple vote against solar would fail. So the utilities are masking their anti-solar amendment as pro-solar.

Even more disturbing than [Donald Trump]'s lewd comments, however, is his underlying rationale. He knows the behavior he is bragging about is out of bounds. He just doesn't care. He can get away with it because he's a "star." He doesn't have to pay taxes because he's "brilliant." He doesn't need foreign policy experts because he has a "great brain."

Clearly, Trump thinks that rules simply don't apply to him, a fact that gives the lie to his faux populism. Since the rules don't apply, he thinks that after decades of exposing himself as a classless, petty swindler he can now fool the country into giving him the thing he craves even more than the presidency: respect. Sadly for Trump, that was gone a long time ago. And, like integrity, once lost it is never recovered.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Climate change linked to storm's strength - Oct. 9

Thanks for this article linking climate change and hurricane strength. Heat increases the severity if not the frequency of all storms.

The World Economic Forum, our Joint Chiefs of Staff and Physicians for Social Responsibility will tell you that climate change is the greatest threat to our economy, national security and our health. Why then do we not hear more about it in the media? I can understand that people have different senses of value based on their different moral upbringing, but climate change affects all of us, and I cannot imagine that anyone would not want to know what is going on. Furthermore, the solutions I know - whether local, national or international - are not at odds with anyone's sense of values.

Scientists write mainly for scientists. Journalists are the folks who should inform the general public, and must do so with great attention to the pertinent facts. Mike Pence and his supporters, for example, should be made aware that, for our survival, coal must be eliminated as an energy source, and it is actually fracking, which I assume Pence favors, that is winning his "war on coal." Now, for survival, we need a war on fracking by wind, water and solar power.

John E. Darovec Jr., Bradenton

\* \* \*

Amendment 1

Reject deceptive solar plan

For decades, consumers have heard about the hope of a solar future, one that would allow consumers to generate their own electricity. Given that Florida is the Sunshine State, it's appropriate that the freedom to make solar power into usable energy is protected here under state law.

But an issue on the November ballot, Amendment 1, is deceptively titled "Rights of Electricity Consumers Regarding Solar Energy Choice." It would actually create new barriers and costs for consumers interested in generating their own power through rooftop solar panels. By making solar more expensive for electric customers, Amendment 1 would reduce the benefit and accessibility of solar power, and favor the utilities over ordinary consumers.

Amendment 1 also would make it easier to pile excessive fees on residents who add solar panels. Such fees are unjustified, as shown by studies in Arizona, Colorado and North Carolina, where research found the benefits of rooftop solar outweighed the costs to the system by between 40 and 100 times.

It's clear from who opposes and who supports Amendment 1 what is at stake. Power companies have spent more than $16 million on their campaign to restrict customer-owned solar choices, and the issue is on track to be the most heavily industry-funded ballot measure in the state's history. Their strategy is sneaky: They know that Floridians support solar and that a simple vote against solar would fail. So the utilities are masking their anti-solar amendment as pro-solar.

Consumers deserve a fair choice on their energy needs. So don't be misled - vote no on Amendment 1.

Shannon Baker-Branstetter, Washington, D.C.

The writer is policy counsel for Consumers Union.

\* \* \*

Campaign 2016

An ugly, ominous time

My mother grew up under Mussolini's dictatorship in Italy. She often told me stories of neighbors standing outside her window, listening in on private family conversation. Anyone who spoke against the Fascist regime was reported to authorities. Punishment was swift and cruel.

I have been active supporting Democratic candidates since 1972. This year, I am afraid to put a simple Clinton/Kaine bumper sticker on my car because I fear retaliation from a certain element of Trump supporters.

Americans have never lived under a repressive political regime and have no idea of what it is like to lose their civil liberties. Good people need to speak out against this dangerous trend before it is too late.

Nancy Catania, Wesley Chapel

\* \* \*

Trump's character is set

The spate of "boys will be boys" letters from Donald Trump apologists in Wednesday's Times was predictable. After all, Trump has been spewing inexcusable, often hateful, rhetoric for over a year and it has not fazed his supporters.

But the notion that such disgusting behavior is somehow imprinted on the male chromosome is, quite simply, a bald-faced lie. It is impossible to imagine President Barack Obama allowing any of the countless loutish utterances we have heard from Trump over the years to pass his lips. The president is a gentleman. This is not a trait you can put on or take off when it suits you. You have it or you don't. And you would scour a Trump rally in vain looking for evidence of either one.

Even more disturbing than Trump's lewd comments, however, is his underlying rationale. He knows the behavior he is bragging about is out of bounds. He just doesn't care. He can get away with it because he's a "star." He doesn't have to pay taxes because he's "brilliant." He doesn't need foreign policy experts because he has a "great brain."

Clearly, Trump thinks that rules simply don't apply to him, a fact that gives the lie to his faux populism. Since the rules don't apply, he thinks that after decades of exposing himself as a classless, petty swindler he can now fool the country into giving him the thing he craves even more than the presidency: respect. Sadly for Trump, that was gone a long time ago. And, like integrity, once lost it is never recovered.

Buck Beasom, Tampa

\* \* \*

Rubio sticks with Trump - Oct. 12

Profile in cowardice

By maintaining his support for the vile, despicable person and candidate that is Donald Trump, Marco Rubio has shown all the cowardice and utter lack of principle we've come to expect from him. He could, as many of his fellow Republicans have done, withdraw his support for Trump without backing Hillary Clinton. But clearly he places what he sees as his political interests above those of community and country.

By so doing, he has forfeited whatever shred of dignity and humanity he may have had left - if any - after his shameful (non-)performance as our U.S. senator.

Morry Bornstein, Seminole

**DETAILS**

| **Publication title:** | Tampa Bay Times; Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **First page:** | 2 |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication year:** | 2016 |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication date:** | Oct 16, 2016 |
| --- | --- |

| **column:** | YOUR LETTERS |
| --- | --- |

| **Section:** | PERSPECTIVE |
| --- | --- |

| **Publisher:** | Times Publishing Co. |
| --- | --- |

| **Place of publication:** | Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **Country of publication:** | United States, Tampa Bay |
| --- | --- |

| **Publication subject:** | General Interest Periodicals--United States |
| --- | --- |

| **Source type:** | Newspapers |
| --- | --- |

| **Language of publication:** | English |
| --- | --- |

| **Document type:** | Letter |
| --- | --- |

| **ProQuest document ID:** | 1829547426 |
| --- | --- |

| **Document URL:** | https://search.proquest.com/docview/1829547426?accountid=13360 |
| --- | --- |

| **Copyright:** | (Copyright 2016 St. Petersburg Times. All rights reserved.) |
| --- | --- |

| **Last updated:** | 2016-10-17 |
| --- | --- |

| **Database:** | Global Newsstream |
| --- | --- |

|  |
| --- |

Document 33 of 40

CLIMATE CHANGE SKEPTICISM PERPLEXING

DeWitt, Dan . Tampa Bay Times ; Tampa Bay [Tampa Bay]02 Dec 2016: 1.

[ProQuest document link](https://search.proquest.com/docview/1845243997?accountid=13360)



|  |
| --- |

**ABSTRACT**

"You can't tie a single event to climate change," [Scott Stephens] said. "But one of the tenets of climate change is that you have greater extremes."

Yes, it's some consolation that, as Stephens said, we can't be sure that the drought and fires have been caused by climate change, which means we can't be sure that this is a view of things to come.

There are also signs that we don't care that much. The popularity of big, hideously inefficient pickup trucks has soared nationally in recent years as gas prices have fallen, and they remain a particularly high-status mode of personal transportation in much of Hernando County. Many of their owners apparently think nothing of letting them idle, spewing exhaust fumes and carbon dioxide, to keep the cab at an ideal temperature during waits in parking lots. Another local sign of our lack of concern: 63 percent of the county's presidential vote went to a man who has said global warming is a "concept ... created by and for the Chinese."

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Scott Stephens, a federal meteorologist based in Asheville, N.C., said what people in his profession usually say about the link between freakish weather and global warming.

"You can't tie a single event to climate change," Stephens said. "But one of the tenets of climate change is that you have greater extremes."

Drought in a temperate rain forest certainly qualifies as "extreme," and that is what my family and I encountered on our Thanksgiving trip to the mountains of North Carolina - bone-dry conditions in one of the wettest parts of the eastern United States, a two-month stretch of negligible rainfall in a place that routinely receives more than 80 inches of precipitation per year.

Believe me, there's nothing like waking up day after day to choking smoke from drought-fueled forest fires to get you thinking about environmental end times.

Yes, it's some consolation that, as Stephens said, we can't be sure that the drought and fires have been caused by climate change, which means we can't be sure that this is a view of things to come.

That is less reassuring, though, considering that 2016 is set to break yet another recent global record as the warmest year ever and that temperatures in the Arctic have been running a stunning 36 degrees higher than normal for this time of year, according to a recent story in the Washington Post (which you might not trust because of a supposed left-wing bias, but which I do because reporters there actually get fired if they make things up).

It is less reassuring still because of the skepticism about climate change we've heard from President-elect Donald Trump and the outright denial from his choice to lead the transition of the Environmental Protection Agency, Myron Ebell.

To what extent the two of them start dismantling controls on global warming probably depends on how much Trump thinks people care about the issue.

The good news is that polls indicate images of melting polar ice, of flooded streets in Miami Beach and, yes, of raging forest fires may finally be making a dent in the national consciousness - 64 percent of Americans are at least somewhat concerned about climate change, according to a Gallup poll earlier this year.

But there are also signs that we don't care that much. The popularity of big, hideously inefficient pickup trucks has soared nationally in recent years as gas prices have fallen, and they remain a particularly high-status mode of personal transportation in much of Hernando County. Many of their owners apparently think nothing of letting them idle, spewing exhaust fumes and carbon dioxide, to keep the cab at an ideal temperature during waits in parking lots. Another local sign of our lack of concern: 63 percent of the county's presidential vote went to a man who has said global warming is a "concept ... created by and for the Chinese."

So, obviously, we need to care more.

By the way, a front swept through the southern Appalachian Mountains on Monday night. Its winds fanned fires that destroyed dozens of buildings, including a 16-story hotel in Gatlinburg, Tenn. But it brought the first heavy rain in weeks, rain that should help control the worst of the forest fires.

More storms are expected in the next few days, meaning that we might not be facing a climate-based apocalypse after all.

Not yet.
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**ABSTRACT**

"One hundred and ninety-four countries signed the Paris Agreement to control greenhouse gases. Our own voluntary agreement to accomplish the same goal - the Under2 MOU - has 165 signatories, representing a billion people," [Jerry Brown] said. "We can do much on our own and we can join with others - other states and provinces and even countries, to stop the dangerous rise in climate pollution. And make no mistake, we are going to do exactly that."

First, Brown's numbers need explanation. Of the Under2 MOU's 165 members, 155 are signatories, meaning they've declared their commitment to limit emissions and to provide action plans. The other 10 are countries that have endorsed the MOU, meaning they support the goal but don't have to submit plans.

"They're part and parcel to each other. If you're driving those kind of reductions, those can help you get to the national targets. They're not distinct realms. They're nested within each other," said Brendan Guy, the international policy manager at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

"One hundred and ninety-four countries signed the Paris Agreement to control greenhouse gases. Our own voluntary agreement to accomplish the same goal - the Under2 MOU - has 165 signatories, representing a billion people."

- Jerry Brown on Tuesday, January 24th, 2017 in his State of the State address

\* \* \*

The ruling: MOSTLY TRUE

California Gov. Jerry Brown offered an energetic rebuke to the Trump administration's "alternative facts" and "blatant attacks on science" in his State of the State address.

The solidly blue state voted overwhelmingly for Hillary Clinton, prompting Brown to reflect on California's place in a broader national context in a speech traditionally used to set a state policy agenda. Contrasting Trump's positions, Brown promised to oppose deportations of undocumented immigrants, to protect health care and to continue to act on climate change.

"One hundred and ninety-four countries signed the Paris Agreement to control greenhouse gases. Our own voluntary agreement to accomplish the same goal - the Under2 MOU - has 165 signatories, representing a billion people," Brown said. "We can do much on our own and we can join with others - other states and provinces and even countries, to stop the dangerous rise in climate pollution. And make no mistake, we are going to do exactly that."

We wanted to know more about what Brown was talking about and if it is accurate.

The Under2 MOU, or Subnational Global Climate Leadership Memorandum of Understanding, is a pact spearheaded by California and the German state of Baden-Wurttemberg in the leadup to the Paris agreement in 2015. United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called it a "game changer."

Its 165 members represent about 1 billion people and pledge to limit carbon emissions to below 80 to 90 percent from 1990 levels with the goal of keeping global temperatures from rising 2 degrees Celsius from pre-industrial levels by 2100.

That's the same goal and framework of the Paris agreement, the major international deal between nearly 200 nations. But there are a few differences between the two deals.

First, Brown's numbers need explanation. Of the Under2 MOU's 165 members, 155 are signatories, meaning they've declared their commitment to limit emissions and to provide action plans. The other 10 are countries that have endorsed the MOU, meaning they support the goal but don't have to submit plans.

MAP: The Under2 Coalition

Second, the MOU is voluntary and nonbinding, and while the Paris deal is also voluntary, it includes binding obligations on reporting emissions and progress.

Third, unlike the MOU, the Paris agreement has increasingly stringent targets for signatories. The United States, for example, pledged to cut emissions 17 percent from 2005 levels by 2020, and then 26 to 28 percent percent by 2025 (equivalent to 19 to 24 percent from 1990 levels).

Despite these differences, experts we spoke with said the Under2 MOU was a strong and forceful compact. But they said the MOU was a complement to the Paris agreement rather than its equivalent in terms of potential impact.

"They're part and parcel to each other. If you're driving those kind of reductions, those can help you get to the national targets. They're not distinct realms. They're nested within each other," said Brendan Guy, the international policy manager at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

Under the MOU, California pledged to reduce emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and actually enacted legislation that codifies the target and sets a regulatory process in place. That's a "really high watermark" that hardly any national governments have met, said Danny Cullenward, an energy economist at Carnegie Institute for Science.

Experts also pointed to California's five-year-old cap-and-trade program (which the Obama administration tried but failed to implement on a national scale), extended renewable portfolio standards and its pledge to get 1.5 million zero emissions cars on the road by 2025 as examples of strong climate change action.

Just how far-reaching are these targets and policies? To state the obvious, cities and states do not account for all of a country's emissions, so their reduction pledges will not have an equivalent impact to a national commitment.

California, despite being the largest state and equivalent to the world's sixth-largest economy, accounts for 6 to 7 percent of the United States' emissions. The other nine U.S. states that are part of the MOU (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington) represent another 10 percent of the country's total emissions.

Looking at it another way, if all 23,458 cities from the Energy Department's city energy profile tool enacted best energy-saving practices, it would lead to a 3 to 7 percent reduction in emissions, according to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

"Will these subnational efforts be enough to prevent a dangerous increase in average global temperature? Probably not," said Rachel Krause, a University of Kansas professor who focuses on local policy and sustainability. "But they still can have meaningful impact."

Cullenward pointed out that the Paris agreement's depth is the result of two decades of negotiations, while the MOU is a relatively new compact and will likely become much more sophisticated over time.

"It's no substitute for eventual national action. But it's a really appropriate strategy where you have national governments that aren't interested in taking action on climate change," he said.

- - -

Our ruling

Brown said, "194 countries signed the Paris Agreement to control greenhouse gases. Our own voluntary agreement to accomplish the same goal - the Under2 MOU - has 165 signatories, representing a billion people."

The Under2 MOU, spearheaded by California and the Germany state Baden-Wurttemberg, is a climate change agreement signed by 155 cities and states that have pledged reductions in carbon emissions and endorsed by 10 countries.

While its emissions impact is not as far-reaching as the Paris agreement, experts told us it is a very similar deal that fosters international cooperation on climate change and fills a void in times of national hesitation to act.

We rate Brown's claim Mostly True.

\* \* \*
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**ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)**

In a tweet, the World Food Program connected the loss of food to global climate change. The latest report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimated total greenhouse gas emissions to be equal to 49.5 gigatons of carbon dioxide. Emissions tied to industry (the production of fertilizer), transportation (moving food around), buildings (to store food), energy (to refrigerate it), and agriculture all contribute a bit to the food waste total.

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

As it struggles to feed the hungry, the U.N. World Food Program often reminds the public that in the face of great need, there is also great waste.

Right now, the U.N. relief agency is active in about 75 nations, including conflict zones in Syria, Iraq, Nigeria and South Sudan. In a tweet, the World Food Program connected the loss of food to global climate change.

"Food waste is the 3rd largest contributor of GHGs (greenhouse gases) to our climate," the organization tweeted Feb. 5.

The tweet no longer exists. The program deleted it after we raised some questions, so kudos for that.

Here's why it was inaccurate.

World Food Program senior spokesman Steve Taravella told us they relied on a report from the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. That article included a chart that said, "If food wastage were a country, it would be the third largest emitting country in the world." FAO researchers estimated that a third of all food never makes it to the kitchen table and calculated the emissions that went in to growing and transporting those wasted tons.

The problem is, agriculture is an activity, not a place. It makes sense to compare its emissions to other activities, and no sense to rank it against countries.

"It's comparing apples to oranges," researcher Brian Lipinski at the World Resources Institute told us. "The number for food loss and waste is comprised of numbers from individual countries, and so the data isn't mutually exclusive. So while the comparison to countries helps to establish the scale, flat-out labeling food loss and waste as the world's third largest emitter is missing necessary context."

When we raised this issue with Taravella, he agreed.

"In our effort to illustrate the scale of the problem, it seems we inadvertently mistook the metaphor in the graphic - a mythical country - for an actual source of waste," Taravella said.

He deleted the tweet to "avoid giving our Twitter followers inaccurate data," and told us he would take this up with his colleagues to find other ways to draw attention to food waste.

So how do emissions from food lost and wasted stack up against other human activities?

The latest report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimated total greenhouse gas emissions to be equal to 49.5 gigatons of carbon dioxide. Out of that, agriculture, forestry and other productive uses of land account for about 25 percent. Food waste is about 9 percent, but that's not a separate piece all by itself. Emissions tied to industry (the production of fertilizer), transportation (moving food around), buildings (to store food), energy (to refrigerate it), and agriculture all contribute a bit to the food waste total.

The current research doesn't tease out emissions due to food waste separate from other activities, so there's no way to rank it by itself.

The Food and Agriculture Organization estimated that food loss and waste accounted for about 4.4 gigatons of carbon dioxide each year. That's a little bit less than emissions from road transportation. A research group at Potsdam University in Germany used very different methods and reached a similar conclusion on the total emissions tied to wasted food.

We rate this claim False.

\* \* \*

Read more rulings at PolitiFact.com.
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**ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)**

Rick Santorum on Friday, March 31st, 2017 in a conversation on HBO's "Real Time with Bill Maher" \* \* \* The ruling: FALSE During an appearance on Bill Maher's HBO show, former Sen. Rick Santorum, R-Pa., tried to convince the generally liberal host that Donald Trump was right to shelve Barack Obama's Clean Power Plan, which placed stricter standards on carbon emissions from power plants as a way of curbing pollution and climate change. In August 2015, the Obama administration announced that its Clean Power Plan regulations would require power plants to reduce carbon emissions, from 2005 levels, by 32 percent by 2030. The primary piece of evidence for Santorum's statement, according to Santorum spokesman Matt Beynon, was an exchange at a House Science Committee hearing on July 9, 2015, including questioning of Obama EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy by Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas. After McCarthy's non-response to Smith's question, the lawmaker didn't follow up on that specific line of questioning. Because of McCarthy's verbal fancy footwork, it's a stretch for Santorum to say McCarthy acknowledged the view that the Clean Power Plan would have "no effect" on carbon emissions. [...]in 2009, the Obama administration was pursuing legislation, not regulation, on carbon emissions.) Benyon also cited prepared testimony in 2016 by former Obama assistant energy secretary for fossil fuels Charles McConnell. A lot of pain for what gain?" Aug. 10, 2015 Snopes.com, "Did Obama's EPA Director Say the Clean Power Plan Would Have 'No Effect' on Carbon Emissions?" April 3, 2017...

**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

"The EPA director under Obama said the Clean Power Initiative would have no effect on man-made CO2 emissions. That's what she said. Go look it up."

-- Rick Santorum on Friday, March 31st, 2017 in a conversation on HBO's "Real Time with Bill Maher"

\* \* \*

The ruling: FALSE

During an appearance on Bill Maher's HBO show, former Sen. Rick Santorum, R-Pa., tried to convince the generally liberal host that Donald Trump was right to shelve Barack Obama's Clean Power Plan, which placed stricter standards on carbon emissions from power plants as a way of curbing pollution and climate change.

"The EPA director under Obama said the Clean Power Initiative would have no effect on man-made CO2 emissions," Santorum said. "That's what she said. Go look it up."

As if Santorum's suggestion to "look it up" wasn't enough of a prompt for us to take a look, a number of readers also suggested we analyze his statement. So we did.

- - -

What was the Clean Power Plan?

In August 2015, the Obama administration announced that its Clean Power Plan regulations would require power plants to reduce carbon emissions, from 2005 levels, by 32 percent by 2030. Scientists say that carbon emissions are a significant contributor to global climate change. Advocates added that the Clean Power Plan would also reduce other emissions that create soot and smog.

However, after opponents sued the Obama administration and found some success in the courts, the plan was never implemented. Then, on March 28, President Donald Trump, as expected, issued an executive order that set in motion the plan's dismantling.

- - -

What was Santorum referring to?

The primary piece of evidence for Santorum's statement, according to Santorum spokesman Matt Beynon, was an exchange at a House Science Committee hearing on July 9, 2015, including questioning of Obama EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy by Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas. Here's the exchange:

Smith: "On the Clean Power Plan, former Obama Administration Assistant Secretary, Charles McConnell said it best, that it will reduce global temperature by only 1/100th of a degree Celsius. At the same time, it is going to increase the cost of electricity, that's going to hurt the lowest income Americans the most. How do you justify such an expensive burden, some -- rule that is really not going to do much good, and isn't this all pain and no gain?"

McCarthy: "No sir. I don't agree with you. If you look at the RIA we did, the Regulatory Impact Analysis, you would see it's enormously beneficial. The value of this..."

Smith: "Would you consider 1/100th of a degree to be enormously beneficial?"

McCarthy: "The value of this rule is not measured in that way. It is measured in showing strong domestic action, which can actually trigger global action to address what is a..."

Smith: "Do you disagree with my 1/100th of a degree figure? Do you disagree with my 1/100th of a degree?"

McCarthy: "I'm not disagreeing that this action in and of itself will not make all the difference we need to address climate action. But what I'm saying is if (we) don't take action domestically, we will never get started."

Smith: "But if you're looking at the results, the results can't justify the cost and the burden that you are imposing on the American people."

McCarthy: "Actually this is a cost-beneficial rule..."

- - -

Did McCarthy say the rule would have "no effect on man-made CO2 emissions"?

First, we should point out that neither Smith nor McCarthy mentioned emissions per se in their exchange -- they discussed temperatures, a related but separate factor.

Beyond that, though, McCarthy actually didn't say the plan would have "no effect." It would be more accurate to say McCarthy sidestepped the question.

After McCarthy's non-response to Smith's question, the lawmaker didn't follow up on that specific line of questioning. Because of McCarthy's verbal fancy footwork, it's a stretch for Santorum to say McCarthy acknowledged the view that the Clean Power Plan would have "no effect" on carbon emissions.

In the meantime, Benyon provided some additional pieces of supporting evidence. However, they did not directly support Santorum's statement.

Benyon cited comments by an earlier EPA administrator under Obama, Lisa Jackson, at a hearing of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. At the hearing, Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., showed Jackson a chart showing "virtually no change" in carbon dioxide and asked her if she agreed with it.

Jackson responded, "I believe that essential parts of the chart are that the U.S. acting alone will not impact the world's CO2 levels. But as we've all said, and as many members of this committee said, the race is on for us to enter into a clean energy future. There is technology in this country that can be used to move markets not only here, but abroad, and that means jobs for Americans that we are currently losing."

This is actually a stronger example of an Obama EPA administrator acknowledging the limitations of curbing carbon emissions. However, this hearing was held in 2009, long before the Clean Power Plan was unveiled. (In fact, in 2009, the Obama administration was pursuing legislation, not regulation, on carbon emissions.)

Benyon also cited prepared testimony in 2016 by former Obama assistant energy secretary for fossil fuels Charles McConnell.

"What is also clear both scientifically and technically is that the EPA's (Clean Power Plan) is not a plan that will significantly impact global CO2 emissions." McConnell wrote. He cited calculations that the Clean Power Plan would reduce global temperatures by 0.01 degrees Fahrenheit and that the reduction in sea level rise would be only as wide as two human hairs. "These are facts, and facts are stubborn things," he said.

But again, Santorum wasn't citing just any senior Obama administration official but specifically the head of the EPA.

Does Santorum have a point anyway?

Some researchers have expressed skepticism about the Clean Power Plan's value. Benjamin Zycher of the conservative American Enterprise Institute and Patrick Michaels and Paul Knappenberger of the libertarian Cato Institute, have pointed to calculations using a model known as MAGICC, which EPA itself has used. The model suggests that the Clean Power Plan would reduce temperatures by small fractions of a degree, varying by the assumptions made.

A wide range of climate scientists and policy experts we checked with offered some counterpoints. First, they said the United States needs to take its own steps to curb carbon production if the rest of the world is going to follow.

"Everyone acknowledges that the Clean Power Plan alone isn't enough to stop climate change, but that's a rather ridiculous bar to hold for a single regulation," said William Anderegg, a biologist at the University of Utah. "What is clear, however, is that the Clean Power Plan is likely the single most critical piece of U.S. action to fulfill our commitments under the Paris Agreement."

Second, they argued that even a small reduction would be preferable to the upward trend line the world would likely see otherwise. "Reducing the temperature of the atmosphere by 1/100th of a degree is in fact really significant," said Harold Wanless, who chairs the department of geological sciences at the University of Miami. "We shot up several hundredths of a degree last year alone. Every hundredth of a degree cooled is a step in the right direction."

Finally, Santorum's perspective "misses the thousands of lives per year we're already saving each year by cutting coal use," said Rob Jackson, a professor at the Stanford University School of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences. And tallying up the impact of just the Clean Power Plan ignores other carbon-reduction policies pursued by the Obama administration, including higher vehicle fuel economy standards, regulations on other greenhouse gases such as methane, and heightened energy-efficiency requirements for buildings and appliances.

Reasonable people can disagree about whether the costs on utilities, their employees and local economies justify such benefits. But focusing only on the global warming impact of the Clean Power Plan, as Santorum did, ignores these other considerations.

- - -

Our ruling

Santorum said, "The EPA director under Obama said the Clean Power Initiative would have no effect on man-made CO2 emissions. That's what she said. Go look it up."

Many scientists would acknowledge that the climate-change impact of U.S. action by itself would be modest. However, McCarthy didn't actually say that, and few experts would peg the impact at zero, as Santorum did. We rate the statement False.

\* \* \*

CORRECTION, April 6, 2017: This version corrects the academic affiliation of Rob Jackson.

\* \* \*
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**LINKS**

**FULL TEXT**

Power surge - July 30

This breathless article on the construction of a gas-fired electric plant seems like a free commercial for the company. It did not address what the cost of natural gas has to be to provide power at $6.55 per kilowatt, nor did it comment on the external costs of production and burning of the gas. Extraction through fracking or otherwise has costs of remediation, as does the carbon and other pollutants put into the environment. That's the problem with any extraction-based energy source, all of which ignore the total costs involved from drilling the first well to dealing with the external costs.

Florida must begin to move away from a command-and-control economy whereby monopolies in power production manipulate the Legislature and deny alternative energy production a level playing field. For example, the oil depletion allowance and other tax breaks cost taxpayers about $4 billion a year. Solar power is there for the taking and it costs nothing to produce; no external costs. Costs of panel fabrication are paid for in about three to five years in energy used, and given the life expectancy of a panel, power is then generated free for another 20-plus years.

The solar power available here is better than anywhere east of the Mississippi. Such unsunny climes as New Jersey and Massachusetts produce more solar power than Florida. When the giant power companies allow for competition instead of pushing for deceptive solar amendments to the Florida Constitution, we will see the amount of energy increase, decrease the externalities and costs of fossil fuels and become more energy independent.

Robert Tankel, Dunedin

\* \* \*

Health care

Heading toward a crisis

President Donald Trump's outlandish tweet stating that "BAILOUTS for insurance companies and BAILOUTS for members of Congress will end very soon!" refers to the elimination of government-funded subsidies under the Affordable Care Act. If Trump ends the subsidies, insurers will have to take on the cost-sharing as they are not immediately able to drop anyone until 2018. This results in financial instability for the insurers, which would certainly lead to layoffs in not only the health insurance industry but potentially in the broader health care system. The second effect would be skyrocketing premiums and millions uninsured in 2018. With no current replacement from Republicans, this would quite literally cause a jobs crisis in the health care sector as well as punishment to the most innocent of citizens for no other reason than politics.

This president continues to show no evidence of a moral compass or evidence that he understands the nuance of any public policy decision he makes. It is incumbent upon citizens now more than ever to elect officials on either side in any local, state or federal race who carry a nuanced approach to solving our toughest challenges.

Thomas Vacca, Tampa

\* \* \*

Baker for mayor - July 30, editorial

Baker's dubious record

It is truly sad that this once-great newspaper that I have been reading for over 58 years has endorsed Rick Baker over Rick Kriseman for mayor of St. Petersburg. I agree that Kriseman has had his disappointing moments, but they pale in comparison to Baker's. You failed to mention the attempt by Baker to close Albert Whitted Airport that was overwhelmingly rejected by the voters. You failed to mention Baker's lack of support for all citizens regardless of sexual orientation. You failed to mention Baker's unwillingness to initiate curbside recycling or his unwillingness to confront climate change in a meaningful way, an extremely important issue for the residents of St. Petersburg.

You failed to explain why you have more confidence in Baker to overhaul the sewer system. Since it is perfectly obvious that the sewer system needed an overhaul, why didn't Baker do it as mayor? If Baker's main positive is education, he should run for the School Board.

John Avery, St. Petersburg

\* \* \*

Here is the math on single-payer - July 30, Perspective

All should contribute

You write, "A single-payer system would be similar to Medicare, which covers Americans who have turned 65." In order to get Medicare Part B, those over 65 contribute money every month. I see no contribution from those who want the government to pay for their health insurance needs. In fact, encouraging Americans to believe that our government will supply their every want is troubling. Where will the motivation for people to make better health care decisions come from if there is no connection to costs? Weight loss, quitting smoking, choosing healthier foods and routine exams all help in improving health, but creating a system where your only input is showing up and handing over your insurance card doesn't assure participating in your own health care.

If single-payer insurance was enacted, the efforts for finding fraud and misuse would have to at least double. Why create a "government company" when insurance companies already exist?

P.C. Walsh, Port Richey

\* \* \*

State sees voter cancellations - July 31

Possible double voters

This article omits a most logical reason for the increase in cancellations. It mentions the president's commission on voter fraud and suggests that some voters may have cancelled because they don't want their personal information revealed to that commission. Ignored is the possibility that some people cancelled their Florida voter registration because they were registered to vote in two different states - just as President Donald Trump has alleged.

Looking at the list of counties seeing the biggest increases in cancellations, they appear to be the ones with the greatest number of snowbirds/winter visitors who may be registered in their home states as well as in Florida. I think a comparison of those cancellations against the voter registration rolls of those folks' home states might reveal something interesting.

Alfred J. D'Amario, Hudson
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The statement:

Photo shows severe flooding at a Houston airport.

-- Bloggers on Monday, August 28th, 2017 in a series of tweets

\* \* \*

The ruling: PANTS ON FIRE!

A photo circulating online that purports to show flooding at one of Houston's major airports after Hurricane Harvey is actually a photo illustration created to show the effects of sea-level rise in New York City.

Several tweets on Aug. 28, 2017, showed waterlogged passenger jets flooded up to their fuselages.

"There appears to be a flooding problem at #HOUSTONairport here at #heathrow we would just squeegee of the runway," London-based tweeter @v7dge wrote.

"#Houston airport looks now more like a port. Terrible situation for the citizens and society. Hope they can recover fast!" wrote another Twitter user with the handle @lauslahti.

A user in Karachi, Pakistan, called @MadniSwagger posted, "Ohohoho Houston airport."

None of the users identified whether the image was supposed to show Houston's George Bush Intercontinental Airport or the smaller William P. Hobby Airport, but it's neither. The image is a fake.

While it does show an airport -- New York's LaGuardia Airport in Queens -- it's actually a digitally manipulated photo that was used to show the effects of sea-level rise. A 2013 article on ClimateCentral.org credited the image to an artist named Nickolay Lamm, saying it was made to illustrate what a 25-foot increase in sea level would look like at LaGuardia. (There are other images showing the change at 5 feet and 12 feet.)

Both of Houston's major airports were shut down by the storm, canceling thousands of flights over several days. Bush and Hobby airports were both expected to resume flights by Aug. 29.

An Aug. 27 tweet from Houston's ABC affiliate said, ".@HobbyAirport says about 500 people are trapped. A friend shared these pics of a flooded runway and street with @FotiABC13 #HoustonFlood" and included photos.

Other tweets, including this one from the local CBS affiliate on Aug. 26, showed flooding near Bush.

But the photograph popping up across the Internet isn't a true representation of the disaster. We rate it Pants on Fire!

\* \* \*
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The statement:

"30,000 scientists have come forward confirming that man-made climate change is a hoax perpetuated by the elite in order to make money."

-- Bloggers on Saturday, September 2nd, 2017 in an article on an unreliable website

\* \* \*

The ruling: PANTS ON FIRE!

Climate change doubters have no patience for claims that the overwhelming number of climate researchers believe that humans are the driving factor. Facebook users flagged a recent article on the website News Punch that asserted much more disagreement in the scientific community than is commonly thought.

"30,000 scientists have come forward confirming that man-made climate change is a hoax perpetuated by the elite in order to make money," was the subheadline in the Sept. 2 story.

That striking number of dissenting scientists has been around for many years and dates back to a 1998 petition drive conducted under the auspices of a climate change skeptic named Arthur Robinson. Robinson is a biochemist, conservative activist and four-time Republican congressional candidate in Oregon. Robinson believes human-driven climate change is a myth.

Robinson's Petition Project now counts 31,487 signatories. Before we get to who those people are, the key flaw in the News Punch statement is that the petition doesn't say what the article claims. Here's what people sign:

For the purposes of this fact-check, the key sentence is, "There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate."

The petition says nothing about hoaxes or profit motives.

On its face, someone signing the petition need not believe that climate change is a hoax, nor that it has been perpetrated to make money. While some or even many who signed it might hold those beliefs, the petition itself doesn't speak to either of those conditions.

In terms of the mindset of the signers, the statement relies on speculation.

- - -

Challenges to the petition

There are many reasons to question what it means to have over 31,000 people signing this petition.

First of all, the meaning of "scientist" is vague. The minimum requirement is a bachelor's of science degree. That's no guarantee that the person studied a science related to climate change, or that the person pursued a career in science. The petition's website says that 12,715 signers hold "BS or equivalent academic degrees."

When we look at the number of people with some sort of background in fields that tie directly to climate change, the petition website said, "there are 3,805 scientists trained in specialties directly related to the physical environment of the Earth."

That would be about 12 percent of the total.

There are, according to the site, 9,029 people with PhDs, which comes closer to meeting a higher bar for being thought of as a scientist. Based on the site's figures, most of them don't specialize in climate change, but they likely are more familiar with scientific methods.

These important nuances get lost. A 2012 opinion piece in Forbes described the signers as "more than 31,000 American scientists from diverse climate-related disciplines."

That's way off the mark, unless you count veterinarians -- one of the degrees that qualifies you as a scientist in the petition project -- and physicians.

We also don't know much about when people signed the petition. The website tells us that thousands of signatures came in 1998 and 1999 when the petition was first circulated. It also says, "The majority of the current listed signatories signed or re-signed the petition after October 2007."

The problem is, the scientific consensus on mankind's role in climate change has grown over time. Even if more than half of the signers came after that date, it doesn't mean that those who came before remain skeptical of climate change.

There's reason to think that opinions can shift. When the magazine Scientific American reached out to a random sample of 30 names on the list in 2006, it found "six said they would not sign the petition today, three did not remember any such petition, one had died, and five did not answer."

We reached out to the publishers of News Punch and did not hear back.

- - -

Our ruling

An article on the News Punch website said that "30,000 scientists have come forward confirming that man-made climate change is a hoax perpetuated by the elite in order to make money." The source is a well-known petition project.

The key flaw is that the petition challenges the science, but it doesn't cast human-driven climate change as a hoax aimed at making some people rich. That is pure interpretation by the website.

The use of the word "scientists" is misleading, since a signatory need not be a scientist today and need not have done more than earned a bachelor of science degree in any field. The actual number of climate-related specialists is about 12 percent of the total. And these are not currently confirmed signatories as the list has been circulating since 1998.

For all these reasons, we rate this claim Pants on Fire.

\* \* \*
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Florida's coastal and stormwater infrastructure are "two of the most critical areas during a storm, and received D-plus and D ratings, respectively, by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2016."

-- Gwen Graham on Monday, September 18th, 2017 in an opinion-editorial

\* \* \*

The Ruling: TRUE

Gwen Graham, a former Democratic congresswoman running for Florida governor, said state leaders need to do more to prepare for the next hurricane, especially in the face of climate change.

In an opinion-editorial for the Tampa Bay Times, Graham specifically focused on the state's significant problem with infrastructure.

"Our coastal and stormwater infrastructure are not prepared to handle climate change," Graham wrote. "They're two of the most critical areas during a storm, and received D-plus and D ratings, respectively, by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2016."

We wondered about these grades as well as Graham's larger point about climate change preparedness.

---

Why Florida's grades are poor

Every four years since 2008, the Florida Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers has issued a report card outlining the condition of Florida's infrastructure.

The organization was founded in 1852 and represents more than 150,000 members of the civil engineering profession in 177 countries, making it the oldest engineering society in the country.

A committee of civil engineers updates the card and gives out 11 grades on different sectors of infrastructure, including bridges, energy and school facilities, to create an an average grade. (Florida's grade point average was a C in 2016.)

Florida's highest marks were in ports (B-minus), aviation (B-minus) and bridges (B) in the group's 2016 report card. As Graham said, coastal and stormwater infrastructure scored poorly.

The worst grade, F, is given out to infrastructure with "widespread advanced signs of deterioration," and designates that the infrastructure is unfit for what it's supposed to do.

Getting a D isn't much better: "The infrastructure is in poor to fair condition and mostly below standard, with many elements approaching the end of their service life. A large portion of the system exhibits significant deterioration. Condition and capacity are of serious concern with strong risk of failure."

The section about coastal areas takes a close look at the Sunshine State's 825 miles of beaches. That area received a D-plus grade in 2016, jsut like Graham said.

According to the organization, almost 61 percent of Florida's beaches are eroding and need "ongoing maintenance" to fight the trend. The group put some of the fault on state policymakers, adding that "over the last 10 years, the average difference between requested and state appropriated funds exceeded $40 million per year."

It shouldn't come as a surprise that hurricanes and major storm events can really mess up coastal areas and beaches. During periods of extreme rain, the chance for flooding increases. Flooding combined with wind, leads to beach erosion and jeopardizes the integrity of important infrastructure, like power plants, along the coast.

Florida's stormwater infrastructure, which include the drains that capture excess rain water and transport it for cleaning, received a D. Based on the ASCE's assessment, Florida needs about $1.1 billion through 2019 to update its stormwater infrastructure. However, as needs for improvement have increased, utility fees to upkeep the systems have decreased since 2011.

Stormwater infrastructure is put into overdrive during storms and hurricanes. Increasing the amount of water compromises the natural ability of the ground to absorb water, making stormwater systems function worse.

There's no doubt that stormwater and coastal area infrastructure are critical when a storm hits, and experts agreed that the ASCE's assessment is right on track.

Experts said that coastal infrastructure does not work well under "king" tides, heavy storms, or heavy rains in part because of the state's low elevation, lack of pumping of water and some lack of attention.

"Stormwater (issues), like water and sewer, are not very glamorous and are therefore often ignored until they hit crisis mode," said Fred Bloetscher, an American Society of Civil Engineers member and a civil, environmental and geomatics engineering professor at Florida Atlantic University.

Experts also agreed that the crux of Graham's claim -- that Florida's coastal and stormwater infrastructure is not prepared to handle climate change -- is also accurate.

That's in part because the state isn't taking preventative measures to better prepare. For example, experts said a starting point for Florida would be to tighten building codes and increase the number of "disaster reduction structures."

Experts at the University of South Florida pointed to the "monolithic concrete dome home" that easily withstands hurricane winds and flooding events.

"We wonder why we don't see more of these," said T.H. Culhane, the director of climate change and sustainability at the University of South Florida.

But not all hope is lost, according to Dave Randle, USF's director of sustainable tourism.

"It might be too late for the next hurricane but the sooner we start the more we could prevent damage in the future," Randle said.

---

Our ruling

Graham said that Florida's coastal area and stormwater infrastructure are not prepared to handle climate change, adding that the state "received D-plus and D ratings, respectively, by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2016."

Graham is accurately citing a report card given out by the oldest engineering society in the country and experts vouched for the group's assessment and Graham's larger point. Florida has failed to take preventative measures in the past and it needs to update its existing infrastructure to prepare for climate change.

We rate this claim True.

\* \* \*
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