



56% of legislators read *Environment & Climate News!*

Environment & Climate News

©2008 The Heartland Institute

The Monthly Newspaper For Common-Sense Environmentalists

Vol. 11 No. 2 February 2008

SKEPTICAL SCIENTISTS MAKE WAVES AT BALI CLIMATE CONFERENCE PAGES 10-12



President Bush Signs Expensive Energy Measure

By Cheryl K. Chumley

The massive energy bill signed by President George W. Bush on December 19 will have serious negative effects on the economy, according to policy experts.

The new law will restrict vehicle
ENERGY p. 16

Computer Models Fail to Predict Climate

By Drew Thornley

Computer models that form the basis for future global warming predictions have projected significantly more warming in recent years than has actually occurred, concludes a comprehensive new sci-

COMPUTER p. 4

EPA Denies California's Attempt to Impose Car Emissions Standard

Agency prefers nationwide standard over state patchwork

By James M. Taylor

Greenhouse gas emissions from automotive vehicles are best addressed at the national level, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined. Accordingly, EPA has denied California's request

for a waiver of federal standards through which the state hoped to impose more draconian restrictions on automobile emissions.

Patchwork Regulations Criticized

EPA offered several reasons for its December 19 decision to continue

requiring national consistency in automotive emissions standards.

Most notably, EPA observed significantly more stringent fuel economy requirements in the new federal energy bill will reduce greenhouse gas emissions on a national level; a single,

EMISSIONS p. 6

BP Expansion No Threat to Lake Michigan

By James M. Taylor

The BP oil company's plans to expand its Whiting, Indiana refinery will not hurt Lake Michigan, according to a study commissioned by Indiana Gov.

REFINERY p. 19

INSIDE ECN

- 3 Climate Change Roundup
- 4 Chicago Temp Station Unreliable
- 5 Scientists Examine Bee CCD
- 6 Groups Protest Water Grab
- 7 Oregon Salmon Plan in Court
- 8 Coal Plants Rejected in Kansas
- 12 Aussie Scientists Endorse GM
- 17 Great Lakes Compact Exposed



NON PROFIT ORGANIZATION
US POSTAGE PAID
BEAVER DAM, WI
PERMIT NO. 412

The Heartland Institute
19 South LaSalle #903
Chicago, IL 60603

Chicago Temperature Station Riddled with Problems

By Anthony Watts

An analysis of the official temperature station at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport illustrates many of the problems that lead to false indications of global warming.

The community around O'Hare was much smaller during World War II, when the airport was built, than it is now. The area had a significantly less-urban population and lacked the acres of concrete and asphalt that exist there today.

It's a safe bet, then, that there is an urban heat island effect at O'Hare that would make temperature readings indicate a gradual warming that has nothing to do with global or regional climate.

Database Riddled with Errors

O'Hare also suffers from inconsistency in reading locations.

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) database, O'Hare's Automated Surface Observation Station (ASOS) is currently located at the Air National Guard Base there.

But that database must be wrong because, according to the Illinois National

Guard, they moved from O'Hare in 1993.

This isn't surprising. The NOAA/National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) database is riddled with such errors. The current registered latitude and longitude—41.9786N, 87.9048W—places the station in the middle of the parking garage, which is definitely not accurate.

“An analysis of the official temperature station at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport illustrates many of the problems that lead to false indications of global warming.”

Curiously, the NOAA/NCDC meteorology measurement system database reports that even though this station is listed as an “ASOS,” it doesn't have the typical ASOS equipment found at other airports. It appears one of the busiest airports in the world has nonstandard equipment, with one exception. The database lists “Hygrothermometer,” though it doesn't identify the model. Model HO83

is known to be fraught with errors.

Changing Locations, Equipment

The NOAA database says prior to 1992 the temperature station was at the O'Hare Corporate Tower on West Higgins Road, and prior to that at the Hardstand Operations Building (as recently as 1989), and before that at the old air terminal (circa 1958 and earlier).

In 1958 the station used a standard Stevenson Screen and mercury max-min thermometers. Today it is a completely different set of equipment in a completely different location in completely different surroundings.

Perhaps most important in determining whether the station's readings are comparable over time, the temperature station is now in proximity to a much larger and busier airport.



O'Hare International Airport

All of these factors negatively affect scientists' ability to accurately measure long-term temperature trends. The O'Hare station is a vivid example of the problem.

Anthony Watts (info@surfacestations.org) is a veteran meteorologist from Chico, California. Watts is currently assembling data and conducting a comprehensive analysis of the nation's official temperature reading stations, which can be found at <http://www.surfacestations.org>.

Computer

Continued from page 1

tific study.

“A Comparison of Tropical Temperature Trends with Model Predictions,” published in the December 2007 *International Journal of Climatology*, is the latest study to cast doubt on the efficacy of climate modeling. Climate scientists David H. Douglass, John Christy, and S. Fred Singer analyzed 22 climate models and found their predictions at odds with actual warming over the past 30 years.

No Human Fingerprint

Most of the models predicted significant middle- and upper-troposphere warming, yet actual warming was minimal.

Douglass and his colleagues write, “Model results and observed temperature trends are in disagreement in most of the tropical troposphere, being separated by more than twice the uncertainty of the model mean. In layers near 5 km, the modelled trend is 100 to 300% higher than observed, and, above 8 km, modelled and observed trends have opposite

signs.”

Christy, an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) contributor, noted in a December 6 press statement, “Satellite data and independent balloon data agree that atmospheric warming trends do not exceed those of the surface. Greenhouse models, on the other hand, demand that atmospheric trend values be 2-3 times greater. Satellite observations suggest that greenhouse models ignore negative feedbacks, produced by clouds and by water vapor, that diminish the warming effects of carbon dioxide.”

Models Don't Reflect Causes

Many top climate scientists point out climate models are incapable of handling confounding factors such as cloud cover and water vapor (the dominant greenhouse gas), thus distorting climate predictions.

Additionally, they note, the models do not reflect the actual causes of warming. Richard Lindzen, a professor of meteorology at MIT, says the models used by the IPCC and other alarmists assign too much warming resulting from increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide, rendering the models' predictions inaccurate.

Singer writes, “Dire predictions of future warming are based almost entirely on computer climate models, yet these models do not accurately understand the role of water vapor. Plus, computer models cannot account for the observed cooling of much of the past century (1940-75), nor for the observed patterns of warming. For example, the Antarctic is cooling while models predict warming. And where the models call for the middle atmosphere to warm faster than the surface, the observations show the exact opposite.”

“Computer models that form the basis for future global warming predictions have projected significantly more warming in recent years than has actually occurred ...”

Computer Programs Inadequate

Computers, no matter how big, cannot take account of all of the earth's complexities and processes, critics of the alarmist models also note. As a result, no current climate model can explain the causes

of climate changes, accurately predict future climate, or form a sound basis for environmental policy.

“Mother Nature simply operates at a level of complexity that is, at this point, beyond the mastery of mere mortals (such as scientists) and the tools available to us,” Christy was quoted as saying in *The Wall Street Journal* on November 1.

“Can the models accurately explain the climate from the recent past? It seems that the answer is no,” summarized Douglass in the press statement.

“This new study adds another nail to the coffin of alarmist global warming theory,” said Sterling Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis.

“Alarmist global warming theory is totally dependent on computer models predicting accelerating warming in the future,” Burnett noted, “yet the models have predicted such warming in the past, and the predicted warming has failed to materialize. This hardly seems a reliable indicator of future warming.”

Drew Thornley (dthornley@texaspolicy.com) is a policy analyst at the Texas Public Policy Foundation.