



Document Details

Docket ID:	CDC-2018-0088
Docket Title:	Extension (NCEZID) Laboratory Response Network (0920-0850)
Document File:	
Docket Phase:	Notice
Phase Sequence:	1
Original Document ID:	CDC-2018-0088-DRAFT-0002
Current Document ID:	CDC-2018-0088-0002
Title:	Comment from (Anonymous Anonymous)
Number of Attachments:	0
Document Type:	PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS
Document Subtype:	
Comment on Document ID:	CDC-2018-0088-0001
Comment on Document Title:	Extension (NCEZID) Laboratory Response Network (0920-0850) 2018-21570
Status:	Posted
Received Date:	12/02/2018
Date Posted:	12/06/2018
Posting Restriction:	No restrictions
Submission Type:	Web
Number of Submissions:	1

Document Optional Details

Submitter Info

Comment:	Should a educated person believe Humans really control Earths Climate? Since the Charney Report of the NRC in 1979, the range of expected equilibrium global warming due to doubling carbon dioxide has been stated to be from about 1oC to 5oC. This is simply a statement of the range of results obtained by existing models, and assumes, somewhat illogically, that the correct answer must be in the output of at least one model. However, as frequently noted by the IPCC, the correct answer depends on correctly simulating feedbacks which, at present, are only poorly known and modeled. Despite this uncertainty, there are some aspects of the problem that are somewhat better known. In general, the response to doubled carbon dioxide (or
-----------------	--

equivalent carbon dioxide where the effect of other anthropogenic greenhouse gases is expressed in terms of 'equivalent' carbon dioxide) in the absence of feedbacks is taken to be the response when all other atmospheric parameters are held constant. The changes due to concomitant changes in other parameters are called feedbacks. There is some disagreement over whether one should consider the distribution of temperature change as a feedback. If one does, then the no-feedback equilibrium response to doubled carbon dioxide is about 0.3oC (Lindzen, 1995a); if one does not, then the no-feedback response is about 1.2oC. The latter is much larger than the former because it includes the warming effect at the surface of cooling in the stratosphere. If one takes the latter approach, then the most important feedback is due to upper level (above about 2 km) water vapor. In all existing models (in the original models by explicit assumption), water vapor, the most important greenhouse gas, increases at all levels as surface temperature increases, doubling the no-feedback response to doubled carbon dioxide. The presence of the positive water vapor feedback in current models also increases the sensitivity of these models to other smaller feedbacks such as those due to clouds and snow reflectivity. The trouble with climate activist models is that they generally lack the physics to deal with the upper level water vapor budget, and they are generally unable, for computational reasons, to properly calculate a quantity like water vapor which varies sharply both vertically and horizontally (Sun and Lindzen, 1993, Lindzen, 1995). Indicative of these problems is the recent work of J.J. Bates and D.L. Jackson at NOAA who found, using satellite data from infrared sounders, that, on the average, current models underestimate zonally averaged (averaged around a latitude circle) water vapor by about 20%. It should be noted that this represents an error in radiative forcing of about 20 Watts per square meter, as compared with the forcing of 4 Watts per square meter due to a doubling of carbon dioxide (Thompson and Warren, 1982, Lindzen, 1995). More recent observational analyses by Spencer and Braswell (1997), using satellite microwave data, suggest that even Bates and Jackson have overestimated water vapor, and that the DISCREPANCY with models is still greater. Under the circumstances, there seems to be little actual basis for the most important positive feedback in models. Given our INABILITY to detect expected warming in the temperature data, one might reasonably conclude that models have overestimated the problem. There has been no effect on countries from any current change, adding that efforts by activists to establish such a link "is why no one can trust the Green activists. *🌐

First Name: Anonymous 🌐

Last Name: Anonymous 🌐



ZIP/Postal Code:

Email Address:

Organization Name: 🌐

Cover Page: 

Document Optional Details

Status Set Date: 12/06/2018
Current Assignee: NA
Status Set By: Burroughs-Stokes, Kennya LaTrice (CDC)
Tracking Number: 1k2-96vs-pc4w 
Page Count: 1 
Total Page Count Including Attachments: 1

Submitter Info

Comment: Should a educated person believe Humans really control Earths Climate? Since the Charney Report of the NRC in 1979, the range of expected equilibrium global warming due to doubling carbon dioxide has been stated to be from about 1oC to 5oC. This is simply a statement of the range of results obtained by existing models, and assumes, somewhat illogically, that the correct answer must be in the output of at least one model. However, as frequently noted by the IPCC, the correct answer depends on correctly simulating feedbacks which, at present, are only poorly known and modeled. Despite this uncertainty, there are some aspects of the problem that are somewhat better known. In general, the response to doubled carbon dioxide (or equivalent carbon dioxide where the effect of other anthropogenic greenhouse gases is expressed in terms of `equivalent' carbon dioxide) in the absence of feedbacks is taken to be the response when all other atmospheric parameters are held constant. The changes due to concomitant changes in other parameters are called feedbacks. There is some disagreement over whether one should consider the distribution of temperature change as a feedback. If one does, then the no-feedback equilibrium response to doubled carbon dioxide is about 0.3oC (Lindzen, 1995a); if one does not, then the no-feedback response is about 1.2oC. The latter is much larger than the former because it includes the warming effect at the surface of cooling in the stratosphere. If one takes the latter approach, then the most important feedback is due to upper level (above about 2 km) water vapor. In all existing models (in the original models by explicit assumption), water vapor, the most important greenhouse gas, increases at all levels as surface temperature increases, doubling the no-feedback response to doubled carbon dioxide. The presence of the positive water vapor feedback in current models also increases the sensitivity of these models to other smaller feedbacks such as those due to clouds and snow reflectivity. The trouble with climate activist models is that they generally lack the physics to deal with the upper level water vapor budget, and they are generally unable, for computational reasons, to properly calculate a quantity like water vapor which varies sharply both vertically and horizontally (Sun and Lindzen, 1993, Lindzen, 1995). Indicative of these problems is the recent work of J.J. Bates and D.L. Jackson at NOAA who found, using satellite data from infrared sounders, that, on the average, current models underestimate zonally averaged (averaged around a latitude circle) water vapor by about 20%. It should be noted that this represents an error in radiative

forcing of about 20 Watts per square meter, as compared with the forcing of 4 Watts per square meter due to a doubling of carbon dioxide (Thompson and Warren, 1982, Lindzen, 1995). More recent observational analyses by Spencer and Braswell (1997), using satellite microwave data, suggest that even Bates and Jackson have overestimated water vapor, and that the DISCREPANCY with models is still greater. Under the circumstances, there seems to be little actual basis for the most important positive feedback in models. Given our INABILITY to detect expected warming in the temperature data, one might reasonably conclude that models have overestimated the problem. There has been no effect on countries from any current change, adding that efforts by activists to establish such a link "is why no one can trust the Green activists. *🌐

First Name:

Anonymous 🌐

Last Name:

Anonymous 🌐

ZIP/Postal Code:

Email Address:

Organization Name:



Cover Page:

