



## Stephen Hoffman

**From:** ecomment@pa.gov  
**Sent:** Friday, December 18, 2020 5:14 AM  
**To:** Environment-Committee@pasenate.com; IRRC; environmentalcommittee@pahouse.net; regcomments@pa.gov; ntroutman@pasen.gov; timothy.collins@pasenate.com; gking@pahousegop.com; siversen@pahouse.net  
**Cc:** c-jflanagan@pa.gov  
**Subject:** Comment received - Proposed Rulemaking: CO2 Budget Trading Program (#7-559)

**CAUTION: \*\*EXTERNAL SENDER\*\*** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



### Re: eComment System

**The Department of Environmental Protection has received the following comments on Proposed Rulemaking: CO2 Budget Trading Program (#7-559).**

Commenter Information:

Richard Boni  
 None (rjboni@verizon.net)  
 103 Saxon Dr.  
 McMurray, PA 15317 US

Comments entered:

CO2 is not a pollutant. It is expelled by all living animals and is vital to most living plants. I recommend NOT joining the RGGI and NOT increasing taxes on energy. Particularly an industry so vital to the lives and well being to so many Pennsylvanians.

I have found little evidence that the climate is significantly affected by CO2 in the atmosphere and that even if it were there is little we can reasonably do to affect it. The sun and water vapor are far more important in determining the climate.

We can not afford to stifle the energy industry that makes modern life possible.

The argument is that the planet is warming and the humans are the cause. The claim is that 97%- 99% of the world scientists agree with this conclusion.

Logically thinking, this is a statement that is very unlikely to be true.

The first question is who are these scientists and what are their qualifications that gives them the knowledge to be able to make this judgment? I would submit that most are not qualified in this area.

The second point is that it is virtually impossible for this percentage of scientists to agree on any matter.

Third point is that there has been no scientific hypothesis that have absolutely been correct and most were not even very close through the first few iterations. All have been replaced or refined. Although they are practicable enough to be used to describe some thing or event, none are exact and all are subject to future changes. Nothing is science is absolute.

The contention is that CO<sub>2</sub> is responsible for climate change. I have not seen the mechanism that describe specifically how the global temperature is increased with the increased concentration of CO<sub>2</sub>. It is an unproven correlation based on imperial data. The only somewhat reliable data has be taken in the last 50 years. Prior to that the data is limited, localized and unreliable. I would argue that data taken from ice sample is limited to particularly limited areas and there is no way of knowing that the sample represent the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in that area let alone areas far distant.

I am not a scientist but an engineer and dealt daily with the products of nature. When presented with a problem, one looks for simple solutions that can be evaluated without a lot of investment. This allows for elimination of solutions that are not reasonable. The contention that CO<sub>2</sub> as a major factor has not been shown and does not in fact seem reasonable. The concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the lower levels of the atmosphere is about 350 PPMV. This is only .035 % of the atmosphere. Assuming that the concentration increases to 450 PPMV, it would only be an increase of .01% or 1 part in 10,000. Unless CO<sub>2</sub> acts as a catalyst, it is not reasonable that it could affect the earth's temperature by 3 to 4 degree C. This temperature increase is more than 1% or more than 100 times the increase of CO<sub>2</sub>.

The sun is the sole generator of climate. It has the greatest influence on earth temperature. Variations in the output of the sun significantly affects everything on earth. Conditions on the sun vary in cycles. Some of the periods are short, 10 to 20 years. Other cycles are much longer 10's of thousands of years. These have the major responsibility for the climate changing. The second greatest influence on changing climate is water vapor. At 20 degrees C and normal sea level pressure, the amount of water vapor in the atmosphere at 50% relative humidity is about 1.15%. This is again 10,000 time more that the CO<sub>2</sub>.

A cursory consideration of these values would make it very unlikely that CO<sub>2</sub> could have any significant effect on global temperatures. The amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is extremely small and the amount of the change is even smaller.

A fourth point is the assumption that the current temperature is optimal for live on earth. What makes this time so special? Warmer temperatures may actually improve the quality of life on the planet. Increased CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature may in fact increase food production and reduce the loss of life due to low temperatures.

A fifth point concerns the affect humans can have on modifying conditions we consider undesirable. If the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is the condition, many of the sources of CO<sub>2</sub> are not controllable and the changeable ones can not be significantly modified without eliminating most of animal life.

The sixth point concerns what is to be gained by those promoting the method suggested to reduce CO<sub>2</sub>

---

No attachments were included as part of this comment.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
Jessica Shirley

---

Jessica Shirley  
Director, Office of Policy  
PA Department of Environmental Protection  
Rachel Carson State Office Building  
P.O. Box 2063  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063  
Office: 717-783-8727  
Fax: 717-783-8926  
[ecomment@pa.gov](mailto:ecomment@pa.gov)