



“Testimony for CO2 Budget Trading Program Regulation”

Marc Morano

1717 Pennsylvania Ave NW

Suite 1025

Washington, DC 20006

Morano@ClimateDepot.com

CFACT’s Climate Depot

#

**Submitted Written Testimony of Marc Morano, the Publisher of CFACT’s Climate Depot
Author of Best Selling “The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change” & former staff
of U.S. Senate Environment & Public Works Committee**

December 11, 2020

[Submitted Testimony to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection](#)

It is with great interest that I am following Pennsylvania’s climate and energy debate. My family has deep roots in Pennsylvania. My father’s parents immigrated here from Italy in the early 1900s through Ellis Island and ended up settling in Scranton Pa. My mother’s parents immigrated to the U.S. from Italy and settled in Uniontown PA. My grandfather was a coal miner in Smock PA.

Governor Tom Wolf has issued an executive order demanding that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania join the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) and it’s cap-and-trade proposals in order to battle what the Governor termed the “climate crisis.” The [RGGI describes](#) its programs as a “mandatory market-based program” to “reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”

Currently, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont all participate in the program attempting “to cap and reduce CO2 emissions from the power sector.”

Why would Pennsylvania want to subject itself to more outside interference in its energy policies?

Now let's examine why the Governor wants Pennsylvania to resurrect these failed policies of the past.

In 2019, Pennsylvania Governor Wolf not only has declared a "climate crisis" but he claims he climate efforts will somehow alter Pennsylvania storms and weather.

The University of London professor emeritus Philip Stott has refuted the notion that governments can fiddle with CO2 emissions and get the desired climate they seek.

"Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, and the very idea that we can manage climate change predictably by understanding and manipulating at the margins one politically selected factor (CO2), is as misguided as it gets. It's scientific nonsense," Stott has noted.

Meanwhile, Pittsburgh's KDKA, the [CBS affiliate reported](#): "The governor points to our most recent weather is reason enough (for RGGI climate efforts).

Gov. Wolf declared: "2018 was Pennsylvania's wettest year on record. the storms that came brought pounding rain, causing floods in communities of all sizes."

The first question is, are floods increasing? The peer-reviewed evidence and data clearly says no.

A 2017 study found [on floods found 'approximately the number expected due to chance alone' – No 'global warming' signal](#)

Another 2017 [study in the Journal of Hydrology found no increase in floods – 'Compelling evidence for increased flooding at a global scale is lacking' – Extreme Weather expert Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. comments on new study: 'New empirical study: Are floods increasing in North America and Europe? No \(and consistent with IPCC.\)'](#)

Previous studies have been unable [to link extreme weather of droughts, heavy rain & storms to "global warming."](#)

As extreme weather expert Dr. Roger Pielke Jr. noted: "The bottom line on this new NOAA special report: If you are attributing any extreme other than heat waves to Anthropogenic

Climate Change, you are on weak (or worse) scientific ground.” – [Prof. Roger Pielke Jr. Rips flooding claims using UN IPCC quotes: ‘No gauge-based evidence has been found for a climate-driven, globally widespread change in the magnitude and frequency of floods’](#)

Pielke Jr. : ‘How about IPCC SREX authors on floods? 5.4.3.: ‘A direct statistical link between anthropogenic climate change and trends in the magnitude/frequency of floods has not been established”

Another analysis by Tony Heller of Real Climate Science found that similar claims about bad weather were once blamed on “global cooling” fears in the 1970s.

See: [Rain Used To Be Caused By Global Cooling, But Now Caused By Global Warming: ‘Forty years ago, global cooling caused record rainfall’ – ‘There is no indication that heavy rainfall events are increasing. Every global and US short term rainfall record was set below 350 PPM CO2.’](#)

Also, the U.S. federal government’s own scientific findings contradict Gov. Wolf’s claims of increased flooding. See: [U.S. Geological Survey: ‘No linkage between flooding & increase in GHGs’ – Dr. Robert Holmes, USGS National Flood Hazard Coordinator: ‘The data shows no systematic increases in flooding through time’ – ‘USGS research has shown no linkage between flooding \(either increases or decreases\) and the increase in greenhouse gases.’](#)

Despite the fact that evidence is lacking for increased flooding events, Governor Wolf is not alone in this magical thinking that government policies can alter bad weather patterns.

Former President Obama — just like Governor Wolf, has previously promoted this scientifically baseless notion that cap-and-trade legislation could somehow alter the climate or weather.

Obama declared on June 24, 2009, that the congressional cap-and-trade bill would have huge climate impacts: “A long-term benefit is we’re leaving a planet to our children that isn’t four or five degrees hotter.”

But just a few weeks after President Obama made those remarks, his own EPA chief Lisa Jackson admitted the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill would not even detectably reduce atmospheric CO2 levels—let alone cool the planet.

But these emission plans wouldn't even impact global CO2 levels, let alone global temperatures or storms — which are not getting worse on climate timescales.

Professor Roger Pielke Jr. of the University of Colorado rejected the notion that EPA or cap-and-trade style regulations would have any impact on climate or weather.

“The so-called climate benefits of the regulations are thus essentially nil, though I suppose one could gin some up via creative but implausible cost-benefit analyses,” Pielke wrote in 2014.

“The US carbon regulations won't influence future extreme weather or its impacts in any detectable way. Hard to believe I felt compelled to write that,” Pielke explained.

And former Obama Department of Energy Assistant Secretary Charles McConnell was brutally frank about President Obama's EPA regulations on “climate change.”

“What is also clear, scientifically and technically, is that EPA's plan will not significantly impact global emissions,” McConnell explained. “All of the U.S. annual emissions in 2025 will be offset by three weeks of Chinese emissions. Three weeks,” McConnell wrote.

In layman's terms: All of the so-called “solutions” to global warming, whether from the U.S. EPA, the RGGI membership or any Governor's mansion — are purely symbolic.

Pennsylvania's membership in RGGI promises to resurrect cap-and-trade with all the same arguments.

Let's state the stark reality:

Such planned emissions control as RGGI self-described “mandatory market-based program” with cap-and-trade, carbon taxes and other “climate regulations” serve only to raise energy costs for all with impacts hitting the poor and those on fixed incomes the hardest.

The National Bureau of Economic Research [released a 2019 working paper](#). Climate author Donna Laframboise explained the report's conclusion: “When US home heating costs fell, fewer people died.”

Laframboise: “In the authors' words, we've known for decades that ‘mortality peaks in winter and that cold weather is associated with higher mortality.’ When home heating gets expensive, many people – especially the poorest members of our community – turn down the thermostat. But

lower indoor temperatures are associated with an uptick in fatal strokes, heart attacks, and infections.” Laframboise adds: “There’s nothing heroic about a policy that consigns old people to shivering in the dark. That’s an attack on our most vulnerable. That’s a betrayal.”

And these higher energy costs due to attempts to limit CO2 emissions have absolutely no impact on climate, extreme weather or global emissions — even if you actually believed all the claims of the UN climate panel and former Vice President Al Gore — and you should not believe them.

Trying to centrally plan energy economies many years or decades into the future while factoring in economic growth, population size, technology, and the needs of a society that far into the future —is simply not realistic. International efforts like the UN Paris climate accord will also have no detectable impact on the climate—even if you accept UN science claims and models.

Federal emission plans have no measurable impacts on climate or global emissions.

And Pennsylvania’s efforts will not have an impact on climate or global emissions. Claiming the RGGI “mandatory market-based program” will impact climate in any way is not scientific.

University of Pennsylvania’s prominent geologist Robert Giegengack has noted, “None of the strategies that have been offered by the U.S. government or by the EPA or by anybody else has the remotest chance of altering climate if in fact climate is controlled by carbon dioxide.”

Danish Statistician Bjorn Lomborg has written about the UN’s international efforts to cap CO2 emissions through the Paris pact:

Lomborg: “The debate about the UN Paris agreement is “about identity politics. It’s about feeling good, but the climate doesn’t care about how you feel.” The bottom line? “If the U.S. delivers for the whole century on President Obama’s very ambitious rhetoric, it would postpone global warming by about eight months at the end of the century.”

Obviously, Pennsylvania’s climate efforts will not even be measurable. As Geologist [Gregory Wrightstone noted in 2019:](#)

“So how much temperature rise would be averted by eliminating all of Pennsylvania’s CO2 emissions from coal and natural gas-fired sources? Using the calculations for predicting warming from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, if 100% of the state’s electricity

generation emissions were eliminated, only 0.001 degree Fahrenheit in warming would be averted by the year 2050. This difference is well below our ability to measure global temperature,” Wrightstone wrote.

Wrightstone also noted:

“A [review of the effects of the RGGI last year \(by the CATO Institute\)](#) revealed that member states saw a 12 percent drop in goods production and a 34 percent drop in production of energy-intensive goods. This is likely attributable to a 64 percent increase in electricity prices in RGGI states between 2007-2015. Additionally, according to the study, the cost of wind and solar power has averaged two to three times the megawatt-hour rate as compared to existing conventional fuel sources. Any increase of renewable energy supplies would necessarily further the price increases to consumers.” Wrightstone called the RGGI’s policies an attempt to “impose a costly and economically crippling carbon trading system is an attempted end-run around the GOP to implement a tax without legislative approval.”

The 2018 CATO analysis also found:

“There were no added emissions reductions or associated health benefits from the RGGI program.”

“Spending of RGGI revenue on energy efficiency, wind, solar power, and low-income fuel assistance had minimal impact.”

“RGGI allowance costs added to already high regional electric bills.”

“The RGGI program shifted jobs to other states. A national carbon tax would shift jobs to other countries. A better policy to reduce CO2 emissions is to encourage innovation rather than rely on taxes and regulation. The United States has already reduced emissions 12 percent from 2005 to 2015, more than any other developed country with a large economy, mainly through innovations in natural gas drilling techniques.”

And [analyst Roger Caiazza October 2019 analysis](#) found the “RGGI invested \$2.5 Billion for a token CO2 dip.”

“Reductions of CO2 directly attributable to investments made from the auction proceeds only total 5% of the observed CO2 reductions from 2009 to 2017. Those poor results combined with \$2.5 billion investments costs result in a nearly \$900 cost per ton of CO2 reduced. That value far exceeds the social cost of carbon value contrived to prove the value of CO2 reductions,” Caiazza wrote.

When you expand the concept of the RGGI’s regional cap-and-trade program to a national carbon tax, the cost-benefit analysis still fails.

Spencer P Morrison, the Editor-In-Chief of the National Economics Editorial wrote on December 1, 2017: “CARBON TAXES & CAP-AND-TRADE INCREASE GLOBAL CO2 EMISSIONS. PERIOD.”

“In reality, carbon taxes are just that: taxes. They’re a money-grab disguised with good intentions. Worse still, carbon taxes will not reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, adopting carbon taxes in the West will actually raise global carbon emissions by offshoring economic activity from relatively environmentally-friendly places, like the USA and Germany, to places with lax environmental laws, like China.”

The real success story here is that U.S. greenhouse gas emissions have actually been declining in recent years. But that decline is not due to the heavy hand of regulation. A 2016 U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) report attributed the “increased use of natural gas for electricity generation” or fracking, as the reason for declining emissions. Pennsylvania has been doing it right by climate policy. If you are concerned about CO2 emissions, Pennsylvania’s fracking boom can be thanked.

Thanks in part to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s energy policies, the U.S. is leading the way globally — doing better than any of the European signatories — with CO2 emission reductions due to the natural gas fracking boom. The United States isn’t leading the developed world in greenhouse gas reduction because of cap-and-trade schemes. Unleashing our domestic energy with our technology has brought about this inexpensive, plentiful and affordable natural gas — that is the reason the U.S. is leading.

Pennsylvania is a national energy success story. Why would you allow your Governor — for purposes of virtue signaling, to threaten this energy success story of helping the U.S. convert to natural gas fracking?

Pennsylvania will be ceding the authority of its energy policies to the RGGI's unelected bureaucrats. It will matter little who Pennsylvanians vote for if their own elected leaders will not be able to enact policies as they see fit.

RGGI's climate "solutions" will only end up passing the taxes along to Pennsylvania consumers. But of course, the proponents won't call it a "tax."

Pennsylvania's citizens will suffer. Energy, jobs, competitiveness and economic decisions will be transferred over to regulators who are not accountable to the voters and who will be in charge of decisions that will impact Pennsylvanians every day.

It will be turning over key state decisions to a multi-state consortium instead of in house. Why would Pennsylvania want to be influenced and regulated by states like New York, which has turned its back on science, energy, and technology by banning fracking?

Pennsylvania has a lot to teach the state of New York about energy policy, not the other way around.

Ultimately, joining RGGI will make Pennsylvania less competitive with other states and it will bypass the legislature.

RGGI will do nothing but saddle Pennsylvania with meaningless political feel-good climate change inspired regulations.

Fossil fuels have been one of the greatest liberators of mankind in the history of our planet. Is it greedy to want heat, A/C, lower infant mortality, longer life expectancy? Fossil fuels have been the moral choice in energy.

Limiting Pennsylvanians' energy choices does not "address" climate concerns.

There is no need to be opposed to solar or wind power, but Pennsylvanians cannot allow proven, plentiful and cheap energy from fossil fuels to be banned or taxed for no benefit either to the climate or the state's economy.

The Pennsylvania legislature and its political leaders should reject RGGI's interference in the state's energy economy.

Pennsylvania should reject these so-called "mandatory market-based programs" that will increase costs, bureaucracy, damage job producing and do nothing for the environment.

Make no mistake, these climate schemes are nothing more than the regulatory state and its promoters trying to use the "global warming" scare to get legislation passed that would otherwise not stand a chance.

Instead of keeping fossil fuels in the ground, it is time to proclaim proudly that Pennsylvania has been doing it right on energy.

Pennsylvania should instead keep RGGI's cap-and-trade/carbon taxes in the ground:

And permanently bury energy raising policies and their job-killing impacts.

Simply stated: Pennsylvania's entry into RGGI alleged "mandatory market-based program" would bring about real economic pain for no absolutely no climate gain.

As Halloween approaches. It is time for the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to pound a stake through their heart of this energy, job and economy-killing plan and halt Governors Wolf and RGGI's interference in Pennsylvania's awesome energy bonanza.

Thank you for your time today.

#