Climate Change Debate – an IOPA Tier One Policy Issue

A very prescient phrase from a former governor: "Getting this (CC policy) wrong will be very costly." IOPA aims to police the debate for productive terminology (<u>virtuous language police</u>), and for inclusion of important overlooked facts, especially 'no regrets' approaches to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

Climate Change Debate

Climate Change Debate Findings Summary

Revisit this page, periodically, to observe our progress in this research area. Hopefully, by your next visit, we can announce that some audits have been funded. Also, the preliminary assessment at <u>Climate Change Debate</u> needs feedback and a revision based on that feedback. <u>Here is a condensed version</u>.

Once we have an analysis completed, we will commission a review from a scholar likely to be a basis for civil, informed disagreement, and create conversation forums for further assessment. To be involved in any aspect of the process, e-mail us at: IOPAChief@policytalk.org

Climate Change Blog Essays forthcoming

Highlight:

https://www.wsj.com/us-news/climate-environment/the-new-face-of-nuclear-energy-is-miss-america-c17b35a6

A WSJ Forum comment on that article:

IF you are not a strong advocate of nuclear, especially the newer technologies [SMRs, etc.], then you are NOT an Environmentalist. Nuclear is our ONLY stable-generating and green option. It is cheap, reliable, safe, long-term productive, hugely economically beneficial and, frankly, the only rational power source for primary societal support of a first world economy. Timelines are about the same as your other green sources. Having worked in the wind turbine industry I know it is dirty (recycle a turbine?), high maintenance and fickle. Solar is too inefficient (perhaps a little better in certain latitudes and altitudes) and never will be very efficient (see Physics) even if you ignore its dirty, costly supply and manufacturing processes; same with wind. And the needed batteries . . .