

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

TO THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 14th OCTOBER 2024

Item 12 – Work Programme

Question from Mr C

My question for the overview and scrutiny meeting of the October 14th, 2024 is as follows:

In July 2019, CCC voted unanimously to declare a climate emergency and agreed to a range of measures that would make Chelmsford council services net zero.

I would like to know the following in relation to this decision:

- 1) what are the total costs of the net zero initiatives that CCC has committed to, broken down into spent and future costs?
- 2) what are the quantifiable benefits that will accrue to the people of Chelmsford by having net zero council services?
- 3) does CCC have a target in mind for when the climate emergency will be over? What is that target?
- 4) is CCC aware that it is a well-established fact that co2 rises lag temperature rises by approx 600 years. The current co2 rises largely result from the medieval warm period.
- 5) how is CCC's transfer to electric vehicles consistent with CCC's modern slavery Policy when we know that forced child labour is used in the lithium chain and that no ethical source of lithium exists?
- 6) is CCC aware of this fact about the IPCC that has been pointed out by Richard Lindzen, former Professor of meteorology at MIT:

'The IPCC itself is only studying anthropogenic [man-made] climate change... It doesn't do anything regarding natural climate change and that's a severe technical shortcoming because you can't do things like attribution unless you know what natural variability is.'

The IPCC was set up to investigate anthropogenic climate change only. It has no responsibility to investigate natural reasons for cycles of climate change relating to the Earth's position relative to the Sun (Mikankovitch cycles), the amount of radiative energy emitted by the sun, the fluctuations in the amount of water vapour on Earth; the Pacific Decadal Oscillation nor the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation. Not surprisingly an organisation that was created with the sole intention of finding evidence for man-made climate change finds evidence of man-made climate change (via computer models). I'm reminded of the quote by Upton Sinclair:

'It is difficult to get a man to understand something, when his salary depends on his not understanding it.'

So the IPCC finds the evidence it is looking for.

The IPCC has proposed restricting the increase in global temp to 1.5 degree C above pre-industrial levels. The problem here is the the start of the industrial age coincided with the end of the Little Ice Age (approx 1850). Therefore, the IPCC is taking a very low temperature as its baseline and assuming that any increase from this low baseline is man's fault and can be prevented. To think that man can control Earth's climate is as full of hubris as men thinking they can control the tides by ordering them to stop or that man can control the rains by making sacrifices to the gods. At times like these, I realise that for all our fancy gadgets, we humans remain superstitious and full of our own self-importance.

Another criticism that is often levelled at the IPCC is that its 'summary for policy makers' is unnecessarily alarmist and does not accurately reflect the info buried deep in the report. For example Chapter 12 of IPCC report #6 states that: 'there is a low confidence of an increase in floods, rainstorms, landslides, drought, "fire weather," cyclones, hurricanes, tornadoes, sand storms, dust storms, hail, sea level rise, coastal flooding, and erosion.' But no one reads that bit!

7) is CCC aware that human activity having a non-trivial impact on the Earth's climate is merely a theory, a theory for which the only evidence is inaccurate computer models? Has the O&S committee obtained any evidence that proves humans are having a non-trivial impact on the Climate?

Since this committee is responsible for scrutinising existing council policies, I would ask that you review the climate emergency policy as it is expensive, provides no benefits, is unethical, undemocratic and has no evidence to support it.