Editors to email it to. editors@sciam.com; opinion@thehill.com; letters@thehill.com
Dave White 503-608-7611, research@cctruth.org

The IPCC Gets a Watchdog

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

ABSTRACT: Climate change hysteria is driven by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports that are too often imprecise and misleading regarding climate data. Moreover, the IPCC sometimes neglects to properly benchmark data, resulting in invalid simulation results and faulty recommendations. This is the conclusion of a team of 35 doctoral level scientists who function as an official watchdog group to investigate, fact-check, and occasionally challenge the IPCC when it steps out of bounds with unwarranted recommendations.

The team was set up after author, Dave White, presented his statistical analysis of climate change data in 2019 to the National Academy of Sciences', Dr. Mike Kuperberg (mKuperberg@globalchange.gov; mKuperberg@usgcrp.gov). Kuperberg is also the Executive Director of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). He recognized the validity of the analysis and immediately submitted it to other scientists in his office. Their mandate was for White to assemble a team of scientists to participate in the annual "Expert and Government Review (EAGR)" program of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports. Globalchange.gov was shutdown and Dr. Mike Kuperberg is

now executive director of whale museum https://whalemuseum.org/pages/executive-director.

The ranks of this team of doctoral level scientists soon swelled to over thirty, who collaborated in preparation of a college textbook on environmental science authored by White. Together they participated in the “EAGR” program and began exposing erroneous science in the IPCC reports. In addition, they prevailed on the Nature Climate Change journal to replace the Senior Editor, whose PhD in political Science left him sorely lacking in hard science credentials. The Editor was allowing IPCC scientists to publish loosely referenced manuscripts and circular reference them in their reports. This, of course, is unacceptable scientific protocol, resulting in IPCC reports that are often severely distorted. The IPCC writers self-identify as climate experts and inform journalists and governments worldwide in their reports on what to believe about climate change. Misleading reports result in government policies that negatively impact every person and business around the globe through unnecessarily harmful economic restrictions and taxation.

This team, comprised of 35 doctoral-level scientists, most of them college professors, swiftly grew under White’s direction. The involvement of our “Doubting Thomas” group in the "EAGR" program has evolved into a platform to identify and address inherent problems that creep into the IPCC Reports. This collaborative effort with the IPCC is contributing significantly to the ongoing discourse on climate science within the scientific community.

+++++End of Abstract+++++

Somehow the conclusions of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change never made sense to me. As a Chemical Engineer and Statistician I sensed that the numbers just didn't add up. In spite of billions spent on controlling emissions of carbon dioxide, why had virtually nothing been accomplished to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide?

In 2016 I decided to crunch some numbers and see what was actually going on. Step one was gathering all the pertinent data I could get my hands on. That included climate change data of the IEA and NOAA Mauna Loa carbon dioxide rise.

A Preliminary Experiment

On the Effect of Photosynthesis on Carbon Emissions

Based on years of experience, my statistical analyses demonstrated conclusively that carbon dioxide emissions are not in fact the cause of the rise in carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. If not, then what is?

I reasoned that atmospheric carbon dioxide is a binary system statistically. The two causal

factors are carbon dioxide emissions and loss of photosynthesis. Since carbon dioxide emissions are clearly not the cause, then there must exist a loss of photosynthesis cause and solution.

This of course made perfect sense because many nations - Brazil in particular - had engaged in An orgy of deforestation for over 50 years. I wondered if reforestation along arterial highways might serve the dual purpose of neutralizing carbon emissions and replenishing oxygen in the Atmosphere?

I embarked on a two-year experiment to test this hypothesis. This involved setting up NIST sensors to measure carbon dioxide levels on Highway 26 as it winds up out of Portland headed toward the coast. For about a mile, the highway is flanked on both sides by a heavy old-growth of Douglas Fir.

This experiment proved that the native trees and shrubs absorbed all the exhaust fumes of 160,000 cars and trucks on the highway each day. The findings of this experiment have profound implications for climate change policy at every level of government. Moreover, it demonstrates the relative ease by which the climate

crisis may be resolved and the important steps already underway to resolve it by collaboration with some of the world's biggest national players.

Applied Science: Nations Are Already Winning the Battle Against Climate Change

China, India, Pakistan, and Peru are leading the way toward resolving the Carbon Dioxide imbalance in the atmosphere. I called into the administrative departments of all of these governments, presented the research and persuaded all of them to start planting trees. It turns out the solution is hiding in plain sight. India stopped deforestation and is planting trees! China is planting billions of trees! Pakistan planted 1 billion trees in 2018, 2 billion more in 2019, and they will plant 8 billion more in the next four years! Peru stopped deforestation in 2020! And now at last Brazil has turned the corner also with its new President as of 2023.

So what have been the results in terms of CO2 levels in the atmosphere. Although the IPCC is reluctant to admit it, Carbon Dioxide emission levels have already stabilized. As demonstrated later in this article it is impossible for emissions control to have any such positive effect in so short a time due to the

drag of Carbon Dioxide Residence Time. The only possible cause is increased photosynthesis in the past few years.

Already after planting 23 billion trees the global garden greening atmospheric Carbon Dioxide minimum on

October 4th, 2019 was 407.51 ppm. In November of 2019. Dr Pieter Tans said it should have been 408.6+/- 0.5. For

November the rise was -0.45 ppm. (11/1= 411.02, 4/20=410.57), and on November of 2017 it was 2.7 ppm rise.

November 2018 recorded a 1.85 ppm rise. Eight billion more trees are scheduled in each of the next 4 years to

accelerate this trend. Based on these numbers we can easily plant 100 billion trees in the USA and in 10 years will

consume an extra 10 billion tons annually.

Sea Level Rise as Proof of Global Warming Debunked

So What's the Problem?

The IPCC points to an alleged rise in sea level and glacier melting as proof of global warming and the

need for more draconian throttling of the world economy. They rely on the Jason-3 satellite

measurements, which have a minimum resolution of 25mm, to report a 3mm rise per year by measuring

a location every 10 days. However, this measurement is meaningless because the reliability of any measurement below minimum resolution, drops exponentially below 50% of the minimum resolution.

This is reported in the document review for WG I AR6 **(1).**

Thus, the only accurate measure of sea level are the tide gauges and they show almost no sea level change. The Views of Three Sea Level Specialists, Mörner NA, Wysmuller T and Parker confirm this finding (2).

Moreover, the Jakobshavn Glacier in Greenland has actually grown for the fifth year in a row, as of **2023.** This is the big one that Al Gore and others have led us to believe would melt and cause the oceans to rise 15 feet. A documentary called Climate Hustle II was released in October 2020 to expose this.

In addition, if sea levels are rising we would expect acidity in the oceans to be diluted. But there's no evidence that this is occurring. Tony Heller shows how the ocean acidity is the same as it's always been in the video, Ocean Stupidification.

With global temperatures and sea levels stable, the threat of a climate emergency is clearly way overblown. Nonetheless, national deforestation policies over the past 50-75 years have created an imbalance that needs to be corrected. The only worldwide manuscript for NetZeroCO2E is The Essential Role of Photosynthesis in Defining Net Zero Carbon Dioxide Emissions for Equilibrium Calculations (3). This is a well-written, well-documented, and well-referenced (35 external references) manuscript for NetZeroCO2E.

Mauna Loa Measurement Fraud

Interestingly, the Mauna Loa (Hawaii) Greenhouse Gas Department of NOAA is in Boulder Colorado. The Mauna Loa readings have been deemed representative of worldwide CO2 levels. There are allegedly 800 such monitoring sites worldwide, but their whereabouts is a federal secret – it's against the law to reveal their address should one desire to confirm their readings with a NIST monitor.

Nonetheless, the ICPP Watchdog Group has been able to determine that the NOAA carbon dioxide data – the data that determine the fate of nations -- are conspicuously inaccurate. The problem is that NOAA uses the outdated flask

method to determine CO2 concentration. This involves pumping carbon dioxide air into a flask partially filled with water.

By titrating the water they can determine how much of a concentration change is in the water. There are two major

problems with this method:

1. The pressure from the pump varies from 1.2 times ambient pressure to 1.5 times ambient pressure.
2. There is no temperature control in the room and the temperature may vary +/- 2 F

The diffusion they are using is –D(dc/dx). dc is the change in concentration, and dx is the change in distance.
D is the diffusion coefficient. For a gas, D is affected by temperature and pressure.

D(CO2) = D0[T/Ts-1]m where D0 = 13.942 × 10−9 m2/s, Ts = 227.0 K, and m = 1.7094.

Therefore, the D is first order affected by Temperature as T/Ts-1. Ts is constant at 227 Kelvin.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S00167037130022

The pressure effect is small but not negligible. The IPCC Watch Dog Team spoke with NOAA ‘s Dr. Kathryn McCain about

the flask method. She pointed us to a PDF of their specifications, where we found several technical issues with the

measurements, especially with control of temperature and pressure.

The IPCC Watch Dog Team also spoke with Dr. Jennifer Carney, Group Leader of NIST Carbon Dioxide Measurements and Reference Materials. She reported that they have a team working on a standard to match WMO X2019 standard

reference to NIST standard reference. There's a possibility that Dave White will be invited to join the team.

NIST is the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which requires our instrument be sent in for recalibration

every six months. The monitoring stations have no such requirement.

This secrecy and lack of oversight resulted in significant misreading and reporting of CO2 levels during the past 4 or 5

years, resulting in misleading UN IPCC reports to the world. Our investigation revealed that daily readings were taken in an open flask of water at room temperature. As detailed above, the procedure involves forcing a stream of air over the

flask on the assumption that some of the CO2 will diffuse into the water. The water is then titrated so that a color

change is indicative of the CO2 concentration.

The procedure only works if coefficients of temperature and pressure are first measured to be within an acceptable

range. The procedure is so imprecise that a consensus of supervisors at several levels was required to finalize the

measurement. Not exactly hard science. Readings are supposed to be taken under strict atmospheric pressure and

temperature constraints to ensure accuracy. As a result of our inspection, about 50 technicians have been dismissed for incompetence or fraud. But the inaccurate readings have not been corrected.

The importance of precision is underscored by the fact that the oscillation at Mauna Loa starts with a very strong signal in South America and then fans out larger and larger until it reaches Barrow's Alaska. This is because countries in South America have been burning the Amazon Rainforest for years during the months of October/November through May.

Since 1950, an average of 30 million acres per year have been deforested and burned in this densest of all the world's rainforests.

So much Carbon Dioxide has been released that the small amount of replanting they've done has grown too fast and died, adding to the problem. This massive decay is what caused the Amazon rain forest to become a carbon dioxide producer and an oxygen sink. Hundreds of papers have been published on this. Currently, the Amazon output of carbon dioxide is 15 GTyr-1 of CO2.

However, cctruth.org has recorded 41 billion trees planted in the last 4 years, which are consuming carbon dioxide and

lowering its level to 330 ppm. This startling positive effect has not been properly recorded as noted above, so that by

2031 NOAA will have over-reported 19 ppm of Fraudulent CO2 (4). Fortunately, scientists responsible for these glaring

errors have been dismissed, but much of the damage remains.

The Amazon Rainforest deforestation is a 0.98 cause and effect to the rise of carbon dioxide since 1957.

Amazon Rainforest Rxy =-0.99 The loss of oxygen worldwide is a 0.99 cause and effect to the

destruction of 2 billion acres of the Amazon Rainforest since 1950! The only effective solution is to stop non-

sustainable deforestation of those forests like the Indian and Amazon Rainforests and plant 200 billion

native trees and shrubs.

The IPCC Watch Dog Team registered a complaint with the Department of Commence Inspector General about Mauna

Loa CO2 Fraud and they launched an investigation on 4/24/20. We encourage anyone to download the rain-forest stop

document and follow it weekly to keep them honest.

IPCC Watch Dog Group Calls Foul

The time had come to start pushing back against the United Nations IPCC. In 2019 Dave White presented His statistical analysis of climate change data to Dr. Mike Kuperberg (mkuperberg@globalchange.gov; mkuperberg@usgcrp.gov) of the National Academy of Sciences. Kuperberg is also the Executive Director of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). He recognized the validity of the analysis and immediately submitted it to other scientists in his office. Their recommendation was for White to assemble a team of scientists to participate in the annual "Expert and Government Review (EAGR)" program of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports as a Fact Checker.

The ranks of this team of doctoral level scientists soon swelled to over thirty, who collaborated in preparation of a college textbook on environmental science authored by White. Together they participated in the "EAGR" program and began identifying problems in the IPCC reports. In addition, they persuaded the IPCC to replace the Senior Editor of Nature Climate Change magazine, whose scientific credentials were sorely lacking. His PhD was in Political Science, and he was allowing IPCC scientists to publish loosely referenced manuscripts and circular reference them in their reports.

This, of course, does not conform to acceptable scientific protocol, resulting in severe distortion of the IPCC reports.

Whether this is negligence or simply ineptitude we can only speculate. Either way the IPCC writers self-identify as

climate experts and inform journalists and governments worldwide in their reports on what to believe about climate

change. Misleading reports result in government policies that negatively impact virtually every person and business

around the globe through unnecessarily harmful economic restrictions and taxation. This of course is the reason our

watchdog group was activated – to assist IPCC in its daunting task.

In our initial PhD review of IPCC working Group 1 (ASR1.5), in the first order draft for Ar6 we identified and exposed the

flaws in the global warming potential model (5). This model assumes equal greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations in the

atmosphere, which is grossly inaccurate. Carbon Dioxide, for example, is more than 200 times the concentration of methane.

Ironically, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects. Annex2 had results from measure-

ment of Greenhouse gas effect which is similar to the Rutgers University benchmark data. Water vapor is 88% effect, CO_2 is 9% effect, Methane is 0.3% effect.

The IPCC was ignoring its own data! Any such model which fails to benchmark against these established effects is by definition a flawed model. At least 30 members of our IPCC review team sent a personally endorsed copy of our review, asking IPCC to correct their inaccuracies.(5)

The result? The scientific review of 30 climate change experts, virtually all of them college professors or research specialists, was ignored. That makes the AR6, Working Group One report misleading, and counterproductive as a whole. A house built on sand cannot withstand the storm. However, in this case rather than correct their faulty model, IPCC editors simply deleted the Greenhouse Gas table from Annex 2 in their final draft for AR6. Instead of making the necessary changes to their model they deleted the damning benchmark data in Annex 2.

Sadly, this illustrates how unreliable and apparently agenda-driven the IPCC has become. It is too often garbage in, garbage out. You cannot have an accurate model without accurate benchmark data to validate it. The recently released book, “Unsettled” demonstrates this conclusively. The outcome is predictable: In this instance the Reports had been written to support a political agenda. These findings are documented at https://cctruth.org/ipcc.pdf with links to the

Reports and the spurious data.

But wait a minute. Everybody knows that 97% of the world's scientists agree with the IPCC that the earth is warming at an alarming rate, right? Let's take a closer look. The 97% consensus figure was derived from three hundred and thirty manuscripts published between 2009 and 2013, all of which favored the official narrative, from reports cherry-picked for review by the IPCC. Excluded from the review and survey of scientists were more than seven hundred manuscripts written by scientists who presented statistics and conclusions different from those desired. That reduces agreement from 97% to 33%. If IPCC fails this basic test of statistical sampling, how can we rely on what they are telling us about climate change?

The Futility of Reducing Carbon Emissions

As a Strategy for lowering Atmospheric CO2

The primary reason that controlling emissions to lower atmospheric CO2 will not work has to do with the scientific phenomenon of Residence Time. Residence Time is how long a molecule will stay in a location before being released. So the key question is how long will current levels of Carbon Dioxide remain in the atmosphere, all other things being equal?

To answer this question, we sent out a survey email to 4000 climate change scientists relating to atmospheric

Carbon Dioxide residence time. Most scientists who responded said it was 200-400 years. However, one scientist sent me his meta research on published papers, which show residence time for Carbon Dioxide ranging from 150 years to 700 years.

CO2 Residence Time (Years)	Author	Year
700	Allen	2009
610	Zickfeld	2013
500	Matthews	2008
300	Plattner	2008
270	Cao	2010
230	Zickfeld	2012
220	Solomon	2012
220	Knutti	2012
210	Gillett	2011
180	Frolicher	2010
150	Hare	2006

Even the IPCC admits as much, although they leave a big margin of error. A 2003 IPCC report shows residence time increased from between 5 and 200 years.

In the Global Carbon Dioxide rise there is still no effect from these worldwide events which would have cumulatively lowered carbon dioxide by up to 90% for almost two years apart from the effect of Residence

Time. During the Oil embargo in the 1970's, for almost two years the worldwide carbon dioxide emissions would have dropped by 90% in the absence of Residence Time. During multiple recessions, for each one the worldwide carbon dioxide emissions would have decreased by 40% for at least one year(6). The worldwide recession in 2009 would have given us a 70% reduction in emissions of carbon dioxide for almost two years. The COVID-19 pandemic would have given us a 6% reduction in emissions for 1.5 years. Yet, you can clearly see no signature from these events in the NOAA data.

In 2016, I queried Dr. Jim Hansen and two other prominent climate-change scientists about current emissions and their effect on atmospheric CO2. They replied that emissions had been flat since 2014, and that not only was atmospheric CO2 still increasing but the rate of rise was still increasing.

I asked them how this could be happening--if emissions were the cause of atmospheric CO2 increase? They responded that we must wait another 470 years for anything we do with emissions to show an effect. In other words, anything we do with CO2 emissions has not and will not have any effect on atmospheric CO2 for hundreds of years.

That's because the residence time for atmospheric carbon dioxide is no less than 150 years. This is why everything we have done so far to lower emissions of CO2 has had absolutely no effect on the atmospheric CO2 rise. It's like starting at the beginning of a 100 meter foot race, when your opponent is starting 1 meter away from the finish line.

So even assuming a reduction in 45% of fossil fuel emissions by 2030 the decrease of carbon emissions will be offset by increases in population. Thus, the slope for increase of atmospheric CO2 remains flat; i.e., not increasing. However, rate of rise is increasing, with the current rate at almost 3 ppm increase per year. Then Let's assume we run out of oil in 100 years, so CO2 emissions drop by another 55% to zero. Atmospheric CO2 lowers to a minimum at year 2650 and then increases. We will never reach equilibrium.

This is because we have a massive loss of photosynthesis. A decrease of photosynthesis got us into this mess and only an increase of photosynthesis will get us out of it.

We have shown that atmospheric CO2 is still rising even faster although the CO2 emissions rise has slowed by 50%. We demonstrated how cap and trade policies would have no effect on the rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide because the equilibrium point is too low. The only feasible strategy with the virtually guaranteed result of lowering atmospheric CO2 is increasing photosynthesis. This will in turn increase the equilibrium point to over 100 GTyr-1. The only way to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide is to increase photosynthesis. The correct and only solution is to stop non-sustainable deforestation and burning of large rainforests (such as those in India and the Amazon River Basin and its tributaries) and to plant 200 billion native trees and shrubs, especially in those areas that have been deforested. This will cause atmospheric CO2 to lower to 330 ppm by 2031 (see Graph 11). Use ecosia.org for internet search engine.

Ecosia.org plants trees.

Dr. Tom Crowther (Crowther et al. 2019) published a paper on increasing photosynthesis with recommendations of where to plant. The study found that most of the land suitable for restoring forests is in six countries: Russia (151 million hectares), USA (103 million hectares), Canada (78 million), Australia (58 million), Brazil (50 million), and China (40

million). Appendix 1 shows how to plant the trees and shrubs. This will increase consumption of CO2 to over 100 Gt

yr-1. Not every forest hectare is equivalent in photosynthesis consumption of CO2. Rainforests consume 90-100 tons per hectare of carbon dioxide per annum. Other forests are from one quarter to 8 tons per hectare per annum.

Practical Applications for Individuals and Governments

We have learned that focusing on increasing photosynthesis is far easier, quicker and vastly less expensive than futile attempts to decrease vehicle and industrial emissions, which take hundreds of years to have any effect. We've already seen dramatic results at decreasing atmospheric CO2 in months as opposed to waiting hundreds of years for the emissions based approach to take effect. So here's what we can do by working together as individuals and governments to lower atmospheric Carbon dioxide quickly.

1. Put pressure on Brazil and other Amazon rain-forest countries to stop deforestation ASAP. Also stop the biomass burning that puts 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. This has caused 50ppm of the recent rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. Then after 10 years finish burning what is needed at 10% per year for 10 years.

2. Provide space where public can come and plant trees and shrubs. All government-owned lands. Very small cost. Need website with document for each planting area.

3. Plant shrubs in all freeway medians and sides. This is revenue plus in a two-year cycle. Plant native shrubs at a minimal spacing so all light is used in photosynthesis. This will take in 1 ton of CO2 emissions per acre per year right at the source. The space would not need to be mowed every week in the summer.

4. Get schools involved and planting massive number of trees and shrubs. In their property and the government property as in 1 above.

5. Parks can add trees and shrubs.

6. Close any climate change research group. Not needed, unless doing photosynthesis work.

7. Tax incentive for business to plant trees and shrubs.

8. Wild fire attention. Get a retainer for the 747 plane and use it from the start on any wild fire.

9. Forest management by "strip logging" which was developed by Oregon State Forestry. This strip 30 to 60 yards wide (depending on the height of the trees) will provide ongoing logging opportunities, making these cuts. The side trees and shrubs will naturally reseed these cuts. These seeds are matched genetically to the local soil and climate. They grow much faster because of this. No reseeding is needed or desired. These cuts make an excellent firebreak.

10. This drone can plant 40,000 trees per day.

Bio: Dave White Is a Chemical Engineer and Statistician. In addition to his research he teaches at HyMarkAcademy.com. With a lifetime of experience in research science, Dave is far more than just another science teacher with a degree. His research is having an international impact. He's currently working on exposing the myths surrounding Climate Change and implementing real solutions. He has 30 years' experience since graduation in 1984, promoting environmental responsibility and survival of all species. This wealth of practical experience enriches all of his classes and engages his students in real science.

End Notes

In our initial PhD review of IPCC working Group 1, in the first order draft for Ar6 we identified and exposed the inaccurate global warming potential model. This model assumes equal greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations in the atmosphere, which is absurd. Carbon Dioxide, for example, is more than 200 times the concentration of methane. Furthermore, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects. Annex2 had results from measurement of Greenhouse gas effect which is similar to the Rutgers University benchmark data. Water vapor is 88% effect, CO2 is 9% effect, Methane is 0.3% effect.

The IPCC was ignoring their own data! Any such model which fails to benchmark against these established effects is an inaccurate model. At least 30 members of our review team sent a personally endorsed copy of our review, asking IPCC to correct their inaccuracies. The result? The IPCC working group one deleted the data in the table in Annex One instead of deleting/revising their spurious and misleading model. The scientific review of 30 climate change experts, virtually all of them college professors or research specialists, was ignored.

That leaves the AR6, report bogus, misleading, and counterproductive as a whole. A house built on sand cannot withstand the storm. However, rather than correct their error, IPCC editors simply deleted the Greenhouse Gas table from Annex 2 in their final draft for AR6.

Instead of making the necessary changes to their model they deleted the damning benchmark data in Annex 2. Sadly, this is how unprincipled and agenda-driven the IPCC has become. It is literally garbage in, garbage out. You cannot have an accurate model without accurate benchmark data to validate it. Then they published the Report in a journal whose former chief editor held a PhD in Political Science with very little acumen in the hard sciences. The outcome is predictable the Reports have been written to support a political agenda. These findings are documented at https://cctruth.org/ipcc.pdf with links to the Reports and spurious data.

++++++++++End of Report++++++++++

IPCC Reports

Disclaimer: Sometimes the IPCC makes changes without notification. For example, the Executive Summary of the Mitigation Chapter added our review paragraph. However now to confuse people they start out every paragraph with the same words. Previously this was not done. Also they changed the numbering scheme for the chapters. The difference is they are now beginning four paragraphs with this statement, "**Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions".** The three paragraphs that start with this statement have nothing to do with our review and are just there to mislead people. In fact, they still state inaccuracies they've been told about on several occasions such as methane gas is the worst greenhouse gas. However, by scientific measurement, it is clear that methane gas is 0.29% effect and water vapor is 89.4% greenhouse gas effect. Second Order Draft (SOD) for AR6 review (5).

[Dave, this paragraph (above) is not clear] [In the paragraph below we claim 23, not 30]

The first review for SR 1.5 was 23 PhD's. Ar6 was 30 PhD's.

To review, our 23 PhD review of IPCC working Group 1 first order draft for Ar6 identified the fatal errors in the IPCC global warming potential model. This model assumes equal greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. Such an equal concentration never occurs in the real world. For example, carbon dioxide is more than 200 times the concentration of methane. Surprisingly, in Group 1, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects, which was being ignored. Any model which fails to benchmark the correct data and the correct order is a fraud.

Our review was sent by at least 23 team members to inform IPCC of their obligation to benchmark their Annex 2 table to the correct order of GHG effects.

Unfortunately, IPCC chose not to benchmark their final draft of Ar6, but instead chose to delete the incriminating table in Annex 2. This left their sham GWP model intact. This wasn't just a simple oversight of the benchmarked data. The IPCC purposely concealed the fact that their alleged scientific model was fallacious. This elevates the concept of "cooking the data" to a whole new level.

How does the review process work? Typically, at least twenty-three doctoral level scientists participate in the "Expert and Government review" program for the IPCC reports. We find a vast array of problems in them. Each member of the team downloads the reports by various "working groups" of the IPCC. They examine each report line by line and then meet online to decide what changes to submit. Then each member submits the same report to the IPCC, a total of more than twenty-three submissions. The total PhD's from the IPCC for each chapter ranges from 15 to not more than 20. When 30 of us submit the same changes we mostly get those changes done like Working Group one.

For example, in the IPCC mitigation chapter, Jim Skea concluded that we need to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions by 45% by 2030. However, the statement in the chapter he was basing that goal on was buried on page 95 and the equilibrium statements had no external references (citations) to any published manuscripts. They completely made it up! Also buried on page 101 was a statement that the probability of their solution to work is only 66%. After we submitted our review, they moved these items up into the 5th paragraph of their Executive Summary on page 6 for Ar6.

https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

This link is also on the college textbook page on cctruth.org

We performed an expert review of IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) SR 1.5 Chapter three "Mitigation" .https://cctruth.org/expert_review_SR1.5_mitigation.pd f . These are the key findings: Their equilibrium statements had no references to any published manuscripts.

Yet not everything is ignored. One of the chapter scientists replied and said they are not equilibrium statements and that they are from simulations. I showed their simulations to a friend who has 27 years' simulation experience and he broke into uncontrollable laughter. Further down in their document was the only probability estimate they made of only 50-66% that their solution for lowering emissions will work. I sent this to around 1000 scientists, the worldwide media, the UN and IPCC scientists. The media ignored

it, however, IPCC working Group 1 and 3 saw our expert review ability and invited us to review their reports for AR6.

https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg3_fod.xlsx is already accepted for WG 3.

2019 IPCC SR 1.5 Chapter 3 "**Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over the next decades, where lower GHG emissions in 2030 lead to a higher chance of keeping peak warming to 1.5°C (*high confidence*). Available pathways that aim for no or limited (less than 0.1°C) overshoot of 1.5°C keep GHG emissions in 2030 to 25–30 $GtCO_2e\ yr^{-1}$ in 2030 (interquartile range). This contrasts with median estimates for current unconditional NDCs of 52–58 $GtCO_2e\ yr^{-1}$ in 2030**

(https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/chapter-2/, Page ES, 5th paragraph). Now their Executive Summary (https://cctruth.org/es.pdf) shows this statement with no references and their probability of 66%. I sent four emails asking them where these numbers came from. A research scholar at The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria replied:

"Dear Dave, Thank you very much for your question on the assessment of quantitative pathways in the SR15. The statement is taken from Table 2.4, bottom section, third row, first column, rounded to multiples of 5. The assessment in this table is based on the ensemble of quantitative pathways compiled by the IAMC and IIASA for the IPCC SR15 process

"(https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15429). The Python script for preparing this table is available under an open-source license at https://data.ene.iiasa.ac.at/sr15_scenario_analysis/assessment/sr15_2.3.3_global_emissions_statistics.html (see https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15428 for the scientific reference of the assessment notebooks).

"Neither the statement nor the table does make any assertion about an equilibrium; it is merely an assessment of the pathways at a specific point in time [bold added**].** I do hope that this clarifies your request. The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria."

Please note! This faulty simulation has us reach equilibrium at 2050!



Their simulations are meaningless because they have no boundary conditions. Their simulation shows NetZero at zero in 2050. However, the IPCC and UN have propagated a falacious 12-year doomsday scenario. Dr. Kevin Dayaratna testified at the Oregon Carbon group with the correct use of their

simulations. This is why nothing they have predicted has or will come to pass: https://ctruth.org/DAYARATNA.mp4

[replace this paragraph with a summary of what Dayaratna concluded] Earlier I sent this review to about 5000 scientists and major worldwide media by email. One NOAA scientist replied that I should go after the publishers of the IPCC "crappy" manuscripts. I thanked him and replied that I would if I had a large staff of scientists. I showed their simulations to an expert in simulations and he burst into uncontrollable laughter. Around December 15th 2019 I sent it to all other than Chapter two IPCC scientists. Our review was sent to the other 200 IPCC scientists who essentially agreed with the review we provided.

Rare Use of Probability [these 2 paragraphs need some intro/explanation – otherwise it's mumbo jumbo]

"For limiting global warming to below 2°C **with at least 66% probability** [bold added] CO_2 emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (2065–2080 interquartile range).1 {2.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.5, 2.5.3, Cross-Chapter Boxes 6 in Chapter 3 and 9 in Chapter 4, 4.3.7} (p 21.3, Table 2.1).

"No pathways were available that achieve a greater than **50-66% probability of limiting warming below 1.5° C** [bold added] during the entire 21st century based on the MAGICC model projections" For limiting global warming to below 2°C with at least 66% probability CO_2 emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (see p. ES, Paragraph 5).



TABLE 2.1

Classification of pathways that this chapter draws upon, along with the number of available pathways in each class

The definition of each class is based on probabilities derived from the MAGICC model in a setup identical to AR5 WGIII (Clarke et al., 2014) [REF 14], as detailed in Supplementary Material 2.SM.1.4.

PATHWAY GROUP	PATHWAY CLASS	PATHWAY SELECTION CRITERIA AND DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF SCENARIOS	NUMBER OF SCENARIOS
1.5°C or 1.5°C-consistent**	Below-1.5°C	Pathways limiting peak warming to below 1.5°C during the entire 21st century with 50–66% likelihood*	9	90
	1.5°C-low-OS	Pathways limiting median warming to below 1.5°C in 2100 and with a 50–67% probability of temporarily overshooting that level earlier, generally implying less than 0.1°C higher peak warming than Below-1.5°C pathways	44	
	1.5°C-high-OS	Pathways limiting median warming to below 1.5°C in 2100 and with a greater than 67% probability of temporarily overshooting that level earlier, generally implying 0.1–0.4°C higher peak	37	

(Probability Table 2.1 page 21.3)

The probability is actually zero because the average residence time for atmospheric CO2 emissions is 150 years (IPCC 2003) **No business would spend such a significant amount of money (2.8 trillion dollars already spent worldwide) on a project with only a 50-66% chance of success.**

For ar6 which came out March 20th 2023 the mitigation chapter moved this to page 6 paragraph b.1.3. We forced them to do it https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_Fu llReport.pdf You can see zero references in that paragraph. Only footnotes.

Citation

"This chapter should be cited as: Rogelj, J., D. Shindell, K. Jiang, S. Fifita, P. Forster, V. Ginzburg, C. Handa, H. Kheshgi, S. Kobayashi, E. Kriegler, L. Mundaca, R. Séférian, and M.V.Vilariño, 2018: Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable Development. In: Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In Press" (p. 93)

Use of Unscientific Terms

The document uses the unscientific terms *highly* (or otherwise) *likely* six times, *unlikely* three times, and *highly* (or otherwise) *confident* sixty-two times. In every case, percent probability must be used.
Planting Native trees is the only way to lower Atmospheric carbon dioxide to 330 ppm by 2031.

The IPCC follows a false agenda and a false GWP (Global Warming Potential) Calculation, neither of which is based on reality. Their GWP calculation assumes equal greenhouse gas concentrations of methane, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide and other gases, which will never happen in reality. If we did have equal concentrations of N_2O (laughing gas) for instance, the people in the world would have silly smiles on their faces and high-pitched voices. IPCC Working group I, second order draft (SOD) Annex II found 14 published manuscripts which show the same data as Dr. Blasings. These were published prior to the GWP and the IPCC ignored them. We put this finding in our review for working group 1. They ignored it and deleted the 14 manuscripts! Any model which is not verified by data is a false model. The correct order of greenhouse gases CO2 then CH4 then N2O then NO (highest effect to lowest effect) Dr. TJ Blasing exposed the greenhouse gases with longwave radiation and was thus able to calculate the actual effect.
http://cctruth.org/index.php/ghg/ Methane is 0.5 watts/m^2. CO_2 is 1.94 watts/m^2. The media should not believe the IPCC or the UN when it comes to climate change. Dr. Hal Dorian passed away 4/28/20. His memorial. He is one of the NASA scientists who helped write our proposal. We dedicate our proposal to him.

Gas	Pre-1750 tropospheric concentration[1]	Recent tropospheric concentration[2,3]	GWP[4](100-yr time horizon)	Atmospheric lifetime[5](years)	Increased radiative forcing[6] (W/m^2)
Concentrations in parts per million (ppm)					
Carbon dioxide (CO_2)	~280[7]	399.5[7,8]	1	~ 100-300[5]	1.94
Concentrations in parts per billion (ppb)					
Methane (CH_4)	722[9]	1834[2]	28	12.4[5]	0.50
Nitrous oxide (N_2O)	270[10]	328[3]	265	121[5]	0.20
Tropospheric ozone (O_3)	237[1]	337[2]	n.a.[3]	hours-days	0.40

Planting trees is 100% probability to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Residence Time of Atmospheric CO_2

Residence time is how long a molecule will stay in a location before being released. Like standing water in your kitchen, sink. The water is residing longer. A 2003 IPCC report shows residence time increased from 5 to 200 years. Dr. TJ Blasing shows 100-300 years. In 2016, I emailed Dr. Jim Hansen and two other prominent climate-change scientists that emissions had been flat since 2014, but that atmospheric CO_2 was still increasing and the rate of rise was still increasing. I asked them how this could be happening--if

emissions were the cause of atmospheric CO_2 increase. **They said we must wait another 470 years for anything we do with emissions to show an effect.** Anything we do with CO_2 emissions has not and will not have any effect on atmospheric CO_2 for hundreds of years. However, the residence time for atmospheric carbon dioxide is 150 years. This is why everything we have done to lower emissions of CO_2 has had zero effect on the atmospheric CO_2 rise. https://cctruth.org/residence_time.pdf Below are the constraints I used. Even at average residence time of 100 years Mauna Loa never stays low.

Facts

Residence time was 5 years, Now more than 150 years. Recently I sent out a survey email to 400 climate change scientists about atmospheric CO2 residence time. Most scientists said 200-400 years. One scientist sent me his research of published papers, which show residence time from 150 years to 700 years.

Residence Time (Years)	Author	Year
700	Allen	2009
610	Zickfeld	2013
500	Matthews	2008
300	Plattner	2008
270	Cao	2010
230	Zickfeld	2012
220	Solomon	2012
220	Knutti	2012
210	Gillett	2011
180	Frolicher	2010
150	Hare	2006

https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.10 02/2017JD028121

Assumptions
Keep current carbon emissions rise at 0.3 gt/yr (current)
Reduction in 45% of fossil fuel emissions by 2030 Decreases of carbon emissions will be offset by increases in population Atmospheric CO_2 stays the same slope. (Not increasing). However, rate of rise is increasing. Current rate is almost 3 ppm increase per year. At 100 years no more oil so CO_2 emissions drop by 55% Atmospheric CO_2 lowers to a minimum at year 2650 and then increases. We never reach equilibrium.

Even at a residence time of 100 years, atmospheric CO_2 never lowers. Constraints for this graph. 45% reduction in fossil fuel CO_2 emissions by 2030 55% reduction in fossil fuel CO_2 emissions by 2130 due to depletion of those fuels. 2030 45% reduction in the rate of rise of Atmospheric CO_2. 2130 45% reduction in CO_2 concentration 2230 55% reduction in CO_2 concentration and rate.



This is because we have massive loss of photosynthesis consumption. Globalforestwatch.org/map

Another way to look at residence time is a signature from past events, which lowered CO_2 emissions. For example, the oil embargo in the 1970's, multiple recessions and the big worldwide recession in 2009. The current COVID-19 pandemic. These are examples of lowered worldwide emissions. Below is the current graph of Mauna Loa CO_2. You can clearly see no signature from these events.



On Netflix, please watch "kiss the ground" movie. It clearly explains why we cannot lower atmospheric CO_2 by working on emissions of CO_2.

Sea Level Rise (or lack thereof)

https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/ Twenty Ph. D's and I uploaded comments on Working Group 1 second order draft for AR6.
https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.
Sea Level Change data is unreliable. The satellite NOAA uses, (the Jason-3) has a minimum resolution of 25 mm. They say they are measuring a 3mm rise per year by measuring a location every 10 days. When we measure anything below minimum resolution, the data reliability drops exponentially below 50% of the minimum resolution. I put them in the document review for WG I AR6 for next year. I know the tide gauges tell the truth and show almost no sea level change. DOI : doi.org/10.33140/JMSRO.02.01.06
Review Article The Views of Three Sea Level Specialists, Mörner NA,
Wysmuller T and Parker
A https://www.opastonline.com/jmsro-volume-2-issue1-year-2019/www.opastonline.com J Mari Scie
Res Ocean, 2019 Volume 2 | Issue 1 See this document:

A movie called **Climate Hustle II** will come out October 2020 and show this.

In addition, the European satellite has a 1 mm minimum resolution and it shows the same sea level rise as the tide gauges at 1.06 mm/yr



The Jakobshavn Glacier in Greenland has grown for the third year in a row. This is the large one Al Gore and others have falsely said would melt and cause the oceans to rise 15 feet. https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145185/maj or-greenland-glacier-is-growing Tide gauge data:

https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/ 1-2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%20202,%2015 5,%20163,%20158,%20 188,%2012



The mean sea level (MSL) trend is +1.95 mm/year with a 95% confidence interval of ±0.10 mm/year, based on monthly mean sea level data from 1915/5 to 2018/12. That is equivalent to a change of 0.64 feet in 100 years. (R-squared = 0.805)

Weight	ID	PSMSL	Station name
0.1429	270-061	154	Trieste, Italy
0.1429	170-161	202	Newlyn, UK
0.1429	1612340	155	Honolulu, HI, USA
0.1429	840-011	163	Balboa, Panama
0.1429	9410170	158	San Diego, CA, USA
0.1429	8724580	188	Key West, FL, USA
0.1429	8518750	12	The Battery, NY, USA

The plot shows the monthly mean sea level without the regular seasonal fluctuations due to coastal ocean temperatures, salinities, winds, atmospheric pressures, and ocean currents. By default, the long-term linear trend is also shown, in red, along with its 95% confidence interval. The plotted values are relative to the most recent Mean Sea Level datum established by NOAA CO-OPS or PSMSL.

Ocean Acidity

Ocean acidity (or lack thereof. Tony Heller shows how the ocean acidity is the same as it's always been in this video. Ocean stupidifcation

Net Zero

The document uses a term *Net Zero* with no definition.

We wrote the world's first atmospheric CO_2 equilibrium manuscript is peer reviewed and published in worlds top climate change journal by impact factor. Equilibrium Paper NetzeroCO2e=8.6gt/yr.

Truth about Al Gore

Web search "Club of Rome". This will tell you everything you need to know about the ignorance of Al Gore.

The assertion that 97% of scientists agree with the IPCC is wrong! This high consensus was touted because the three hundred manuscripts published between 2009 and 2013 were chosen for review on the basis of their seeming conformity to a certain point of view. Rejected for the review and survey of scientists were the more than seven hundred manuscripts written by scientists who had different statistics and conclusions from the ones that were wanted. Therefore, the agreeing part is 33%. We are 67%ers.

Discovery: Reduction in

Photosynthesis Correlation to Atmospheric CO_2 Increase. 65 more conferences have invited me to present this. I have not accepted any invites because we have no funding.

I sent these statistics to all 220 IPCC scientists by email.

Not one of them objected to the statistics. Atmospheric CO_2 is a binary system statistically. The two causes are CO_2 emissions and loss of photosynthesis. Each cause is multi-variate. We have had mostly flat human emissions (0.3 GT/yr vs. 0.6 GT/yr) since 2014. However, atmospheric CO_2 is still going up, and the rate of rise is increasing. In 2018, the Rxy correlation coefficient was 0.73 and not statistically significant (not cause and effect). In 2019 it is now 0.63 and dropping. The data is here:

Carbon Dioxide Does Not Freeze in the Atmosphere In the mesosphere, the pressure is 1 millibar. At this pressure, CO_2 freezes at -100°C. The temperature in the mesosphere is -90°C.







This 2010 graph is the only one you will see online. They do not want you to know how emissions of CO_2 have slowed down worldwide.





Carbon dioxide emissions correlate to 363 ppm and is a contributor, not the cause of the rise.



This tank model is like your kitchen sink. Standing water in the sink is increasing residence time. By this model, we need to shut the input and fix the drain. We cannot shut the input because the "natural" emissions are 20 billion tons/yr. We must increase photosynthesis.

The oscillation at Mauna Loa starts as a very strong signal in South America and then fans out larger and larger until Barrow's Alaska. The countries in South America burn the Amazon Rainforest, the densest forest in the world, from October/ November through May of the next year. Since 1950, an average of 30 million acres per year have been deforested and burned. So much CO_2 has been released that the trees and plants have grown too fast and died. This massive decay is what caused the Amazon Rainforest to switch to an oxygen sink and carbon dioxide producer. Hundreds of papers have been published on this.
Currently, the Amazon output is 15 $GTyr^{-1}$ of CO_2.



Mauna Loa cycles



globalforestwatch.org 390->8.6 $gtyr^{-1}$



The Amazon Rainforest deforestation is a 0.98 cause and effect to the rise of carbon dioxide since 1957.



Amazon Rainforest R_{xy} =-0.99 The loss of oxygen worldwide is a 0.99 cause and effect to the destruction of 2 billion acres of the Amazon Rainforest since 1950! The correct solution is to stop non-sustainable deforestation of those forests like the Indian and Amazon Rainforests and plant 200 billion native trees and shrubs.



India stopped deforestation and is planting trees!

China is planting billions of trees!

Pakistan planted 1 billion trees in 2018, 2 billion more in 2019, and they will plant 8 billion more in the next four years! Peru stopped deforestation in 2020! Already planting 3 billion trees and the global garden greening atmospheric CO_2 minimum on October 4th was 407.51 ppm. Dr Pieter Tans said it should be 408.6+/- 0.5. For November the rise was -0.45 ppm. (11/1= 411.02, 4/20=410.57), November of 2017 it was 2.7 ppm rise. November 2018 1.85 ppm rise. 8 billion more trees scheduled in the next 4 years. We can easily plant 100 billion trees in the USA and in 10 years will consume an extra 10 billion tons annually.



Effect of 24+ billion trees planted in the last 48 months.



This drone can plant 40,000 trees per day.

I put in a complaint to Department of Commence Inspector general about Mauna Loa CO_2 fraud. They started investigating 4/24/20. Please download the rain-forest stop document and follow it weekly. Over 1000 people have been doing this since last June. To lower atmospheric Carbon dioxide quickly.

1. **Put pressure on Brazil and other Amazon rain-forest countries to stop deforestation ASAP. Also stop the biomass burning that puts 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. This has caused 50ppm of the recent rise in**

atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. Then after 10 years finish burning what is needed at 10% per year for 10 years.

2. **Provide space where public can come and plant trees and shrubs. All government-owned lands. Very small cost. Need website with document for each planting area.**
3. **Plant shrubs in all freeway medians and sides. This is revenue plus in a two-year cycle. Plant native shrubs at a minimal spacing so all light is used in photosynthesis. This will take in 1 ton of CO2 emissions per acre per year right at the source. The space would not need to be mowed every week in the summer.**
4. **Get schools involved and planting massive number of trees and shrubs. In their property and the government property as in 1 above.**
5. **Parks can add trees and shrubs.**
6. **Close any climate change research group. Not needed, unless doing photosynthesis work.**
7. **Tax incentive for business to plant trees and shrubs.**
8. **Wild fire attention. Get a retainer for the 747 plane and use it from the start on any wild fire.**

Forest management by "strip logging" which was developed by Oregon State Forestry. This strip 30 to 60 yards wide (depending on the height of the trees) will provide ongoing logging opportunities, making these cuts. The side trees and shrubs will naturally reseed these cuts. These seeds are matched genetically to the local soil and climate. They grow much faster because of this. No reseeding is needed or desired. These cuts make an excellent firebreak.

We have an experiment on US 26 eastbound just west of Portland, Oregon. A permit obtained from Oregon Department of Transportation. These sensors are NIST certified and calibrated within one part per million. Graph 9 shows the rate of rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide less than 3 ppm/yr. The blue line represents the difference between the treed area and a non-treed area. Each location has a wind directional measurement. This measurement can confirm bad data from crosswind for example. This experiment proves we can plant native shrubs and trees by roads and freeways instead of grass. This freeway has 161,000 autos per day on it, and approximately 460 auto exit (Sylvan exit 71) per day between the two sensor locations. The final day of testing was 6/12/2021.

Procedure:

Place sensors at 6am daily for two weeks every other month for one year.
Pick up sensors at 7pm and analyze the data.
Put SD memory card from sensor into computer. Import the data into an Excel spreadsheet.

Repeat for other sensor.

For each 10 seconds subtract the treed area from the non-tree area.

Sort data for "smallest to largest" from subtraction result.

Remove negative numbers in the subtraction result.

The negative numbers are from wind gusts. We tracked this many times.

Calculate average for the day.

Things to note in the graph. At no time did the blue line go below the red line. On December 20th, a very dark and rainy day the difference was 9 ppm. In April through June we had very little rain. The graph shows this as lower difference. For photosynthesis, we need these things, light, vegetation, moisture and carbon dioxide. Experiment Summary: This experiment proves we can plant native trees and shrubs instead of grass and they will eventually consume all the carbon dioxide from the vehicles. This is applicable for ±50° from the equator.



$$6CO_2 + 6H_2O + \lambda \rightarrow C_6H_{12}O_6 + 6O_2$$

I contacted the National Academy of Sciences, spoke to Dr. Mike Kuperberg who is the Executive Director of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), He saw the correct science in our presentations page. He sent it to the other scientists in their office. Their consensus was to have me get a team and participate in the annual "Expert and Government Review (EAGR)" program of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports.

I led a team of PhD's whose ranks soon swelled from myself to thirty other scientists who are also participating in the writing of this college textbook. Together we participated in the "EAGR" program, and we unanimously found all kinds of garbage science in their reports. Also, we had Adam Yeeley, the chief editor of Nature Climate Change fired. His PhD was in political

science. He let the IPCC scientists publish loosely referenced manuscripts and circular reference them in their reports. This is not science.

The IPCC reports are deliberate science fiction. The IPCC writers identify themselves as climate experts and inform governments globally in their reports on what to believe about climate change. These false reports lead to false government policies being made that negatively impact every person and business around the globe through unnecessary economic restrictions and taxation.

In our PhD review of IPCC working Group 1, in the first order draft for Ar6 we found their inaccurate global warming potential model. This model assumes equal greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. This equal concentration will never happen in reality. Carbon dioxide is more than 200 times the concentration of methane. Furthermore, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects. Any model which ignores data to benchmark it with is an inaccurate model. We sent our review at least 23 times to them to correct their inaccuracies and they ignored our scientific finding. That makes the AR6, report worthless as a whole. However, for the final draft for AR6 they deleted the table from Annex 2! Instead of making changes to make their model they deleted the benchmarking data in Annex 2. This is how corrupt they are. You can't have an accurate model without benchmark data to validate it.

Disclaimer: Sometimes the IPCC changes things without notification. For example, the Executive Summary of the Mitigation Chapter had our review paragraph added. However now to confuse people they start out every paragraph the same. Previously this was not done. Also they changed the numbering scheme for the chapters. The difference is they are now beginning four paragraphs with this statement, "Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions". The three paragraphs that start with this statement have nothing to do with our review and are just there to mislead people. In fact, they still state inaccuracies they've been told about on several occasions such as methane gas is the worst greenhouse gas. However, by scientific measurement, it is clear that methane gas is 0.29% effect and water vapor is 89.4% greenhouse gas effect. See Chapter 2.

In our 23-30 scientific PhD review of IPCC working Group 1 first order draft for Ar6 we found their faulty global warming potential model. This model assumes equal greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. This equal concentration will never happen in reality. For example, carbon dioxide is more than 200 times the concentration of methane. Furthermore, in Group 1, we found in Annex 2, a table with the correct order of GHG effects. Any model which ignores data

to benchmark it with this correct order is a fake model. We sent our review at least 23 times to inform them they had to benchmark their Annex 2 table to the correct order of GHG effects. However, for the final draft for Ar6 they chose not to benchmark their final draft but instead chose to delete the table in Annex 2, which still left their fake GWP model intact. This wasn't just overlooking the benchmarking of the data. They purposely hid the fact that their science model was false. This is how corrupt they are.

Twenty-three to thirty PhD's participate in "Expert and Government review" program for the IPCC reports. We find all kinds of garbage in them. Each member of our team downloads the reports by various "working groups" such as the IPCC. We go through those reports line by line. Then we have an online meeting and decide what we will submit for changes. Then we each submit the same changes twenty-three to thirty times.

For example, for their mitigation chapter, Jim Skea said we need to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions by 45% by 2030. However, the statement in the chapter he was basing that goal on was buried on page 95 and had no references (citations). They completely made it up! Also buried on page 101 was a statement stating that the probability of their solution to work is 66%. When we submit our review, they put these things in the 5th paragraph of their executive summary.

https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

Our team of 30 scientific PhD's forced working group III to move the statement with no references (citation) from page 95 to page 6 paragraph B.1.3

B.1.3 Historical cumulative net CO2 emissions from 1850 to 2019 were 2400 } 240 GtCO2 (high confidence). Of these, more than half

(58%) occurred between 1850 and 1989 [1400 } 195 GtCO2], and about 42% between 1990 and 2019 [1000 } 90 GtCO2]. About

17% of historical cumulative net CO2 emissions since 1850 occurred between 2010 and 2019 [410 } 30 GtCO2].10 By comparison,

the current central estimate of the remaining carbon budget from 2020 onwards for limiting warming to 1.5°C with a probability of 50% has been assessed as 500 GtCO2, and as 1150 GtCO2 for a probability of 67% for limiting warming to 2°C. Remaining carbon budgets depend

on the amount of non-CO2 mitigation (}220 GtCO2) and are further subject to geophysical uncertainties. Based on central estimates only, cumulative net CO2 emissions between 2010 and 2019 compare to about four-fifths of the

size of the remaining carbon budget from 2020 onwards for a 50% probability of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, and about

one-third of the remaining carbon budget for a 67% probability to limit global warming to 2°C. Even when taking uncertainties into account, historical emissions between 1850 and 2019 constitute a large share of total carbon budgets for these global warming levels.11,12 Based on central estimates only, historical cumulative net CO2 emissions between 1850 and 2019 amount to about four-fifths12 of the total carbon budget for a 50% probability of limiting global warming to 1.5°C (central estimate about 2900 GtCO2), and to about two thirds12 of the total carbon budget for a 67% probability to limit global warming to 2°C (central

estimate about 3550 GtCO2). {Figure 2.7, 2.2, Figure TS.3, WGI Table SPM.2}

Exhibit II

IPCC

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Ignores Key Data, Simulation Results are invalid cctruth.org

SUMMARY

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports are inaccurate and are falsely skewing Data. Publishing garbage manuscripts in a journal whose chief editor has a PhD in Political Science. There reports are deliberate scientific fiction. https://cctruth.org/ipcc.pdf This is well documented with links to their reports and descriptions where we found the items.

IPCC Reports

The IPCC cherry-picks the relatively few reports which follow and support their own agenda, rejecting the greater number of reports that do not support that agenda. They have ignored

the oppositional findings of more than one thousand reports about the Amazon Rainforest. Any scientist who cherry-picks data would be shamed out of a job. More than 60% of the references in their reports were to the previously farce Journal Nature Climate Change who had as Chief Editor Adam Yeeley. His Ph.D is in Political Science. He let scientists publish garbage manuscripts so they could circular reference them in the IPCC reports. This is not science! He is just there to keep correct science out and publish crap science. However, after sending email, to their board he is no longer there. Still that journals manuscripts reference the IPCC reports. The IPCC reports then reference the manuscripts in that journal. Circular referencing is not science! June 2020 I notified the board of this and they fired him the next day. Bronwyn Wake is the board member who took Adam's place. Initially they said she was chief editor for many years prior to June of 2020. I complained and they changed when she started to June 2020. The kind of garbage getting published was like the manuscript in early July which said the Antarctic was warming. This was all over the worldwide news for a few days. This garbage manuscript like the reset under Adam had the title and abstract matched, however they didn't match the manuscript. The manuscript said the warming was a 20-year cycle that started in 2020 and is cooling now!

We performed an expert review of IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) SR 1.5 Chapter Two "Mitigation" .https://cctruth.org/expert_review_SR1.5_mitigation.pd f . These are the key findings: Their equilibrium statements had no references to any published manuscripts. One of the chapter scientists replied and said they are not equilibrium statements and they are from simulations. I showed their simulations to a friend who has 27 years' experience and he started uncontrollable laughter. Further down in their document was the only probability they did is 50-66% for their solution by lowering emissions will work. I sent this to around 1000 scientists, the worldwide media, the UN and IPCC scientists. The media ignored it, however, IPCC working Group 1 and 3 saw my expert review ability and invited us to review their reports for AR6 next year. https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg3_fod.xlsx is already accepted for WG 3.

https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.

2019 IPCC SR 1.5 Chapter 2 "Limiting warming to 1.5°C depends on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over the next decades, where lower GHG emissions in 2030 lead to a higher chance of keeping peak warming to 1.5°C (high confidence). Available pathways that aim for no or limited (less than 0.1°C) overshoot of 1.5°C keep GHG emissions in 2030 to 25–30 GtCO2e yr−1 in 2030 (interquartile range). This contrasts with median estimates for current unconditional NDCs of 52–58 GtCO2e yr−1 in 2030

(https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/chapter-2/, Page ES, 5th paragraph). Now their Executive Summary

(https://cctruth.org/es.pdf) shows this statement with no references and their probability of 66%. I sent four emails asking them where these numbers came from. A research scholar at The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria replied: “Dear Dave, Thank you very much for your question on the assessment of quantitative pathways in the SR15. The statement is taken from Table 2.4, bottom section, third row, first column, rounded to multiples of 5. The assessment in this table is based on the ensemble of quantitative pathways compiled by the IAMC and IIASA for the IPCC SR15 process

(https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15429). The Python script for preparing this table is available under an open-source license at https://data.ene.iiasa.ac.at/sr15_scenario_analysis/asse

ssment/sr15_2.3.3_global_emissions_statistics.html (see https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15428 for the scientific reference of the assessment notebooks).

Neither the statement nor the table does make any assertion about an equilibrium; it is merely an assessment of the pathways at a specific point in time [bold added]. I do hope that this clarifies your request. The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) Schlossplatz 1, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria.” Please note! This faulty simulation has us reach equilibrium at 2050!

I looked at their simulations and they are garbage because they don’t have boundary conditions. Their simulation shows NetZero at zero to in 2050. However, the IPCC and UN have started this false 12 year doomsday garbage. This is why nothing they have predicted has or will come true. Dr. Kevin Dayaratna testified at the Oregon Carbon group with the correct use of their simulations. https://ctruth.org/DAYARATNA.mp4

Earlier I sent this review to 5000 scientists and all the worldwide media by email with delivery and read receipts. They read it. One NOAA scientist replied and said I should go after the publishers of the IPCC crappy manuscripts. I thanked him and said I would if I had a large staff of scientists. I showed their simulations to an expert in simulations and he started uncontrollable laughter. Around December 15th 2019 I sent it to all other than Chapter two IPCC scientists. Our review was sent to the other 200 IPCC scientists who essentially agreed with the review we provided.

Rare Use of Probability

“For limiting global warming to below 2°C with at least 66% probability [bold added] CO2 emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (2065–2080 interquartile range).1 {2.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.5, 2.5.3, Cross-Chapter Boxes 6 in Chapter 3 and 9 in Chapter 4, 4.3.7} (p 21.3, Table 2.1).

“No pathways were available that achieve a greater than 50-66% probability of limiting warming below 1.5° C [bold added] during the entire 21st century based on the MAGICC model projections” For limiting global warming to below 2°C with at least 66% probability CO2 emissions are projected to decline by about 25% by 2030 in most pathways (10–30% interquartile range) and reach net zero around 2070 (see p. ES, Paragraph 5). The probability is actually zero because the minimum residence time is hundreds of years. (Probability Table 2.1 page 21.3)

(No business would spend such a significant amount of money (2.8 trillion dollars already spent worldwide) on a project with only a 50-66% chance of success.) Their probability is actually zero because the average residence time for atmospheric CO2 is 150 years. (IPCC 2003)

Citation

“This chapter should be cited as: Rogelj, J., D. Shindell,

K. Jiang, S. Fifita, P. Forster, V. Ginzburg, C. Handa, H. Kheshgi, S. Kobayashi, E. Kriegler, L. Mundaca, R.

Séférian, and M.V.Vilariño, 2018: Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable

Development. In: Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W.

Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In Press" (p. 93)

Use of Unscientific Terms

The document uses the unscientific terms highly (or otherwise) likely six times, unlikely three times, and highly (or otherwise) confident sixty-two times. In every case, percent probability must be used.

Planting Native trees is the only way to lower Atmospheric carbon dioxide to 330 ppm by 2031.

The IPCC follows a false agenda and a false GWP (Global Warming Potential) Calculation, neither of which is based on reality. Their GWP calculation assumes equal greenhouse gas concentrations of methane, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide and other gases, which will never happen in reality. If we did have equal concentrations of N2O (laughing gas) for instance, the people in the world would have silly smiles on their faces and high-pitched voices. IPCC Working group I, second order draft (SOD) Annex II found 14 published manuscripts which show the same data as Dr. Blasings. These were published prior to the GWP and the IPCC ignored them. We put this finding in our review for working group 1. They ignored it and deleted the 14 manuscripts! Any model which is not verified by data is a false model. The correct order of greenhouse gases CO2 then CH4 then N2O then NO (highest effect to lowest effect) Dr. TJ Blasing exposed the greenhouse gases with longwave radiation and was thus able to calculate the actual effect.

http://cctruth.org/index.php/ghg/ Methane is 0.5 watts/m2. CO2 is 1.94 watts/m2. The media should not believe the IPCC or the UN when it comes to climate change. Dr. Hal Dorian passed away 4/28/20. His memorial. He is one of the NASA scientists who helped write our proposal. We dedicate our proposal to him.

Planting trees is 100% probability to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Residence Time of Atmospheric CO2

Residence time is how long a molecule will stay in a location before being released. Like standing water in your kitchen, sink. The water is residing longer. A 2003 IPCC report shows residence time increased from 5 to 200 years. Dr. TJ Blasing shows 100-300 years. In 2016, I emailed Dr. Jim Hansen and two other prominent climate-change scientists that emissions had

been flat since 2014, but that atmospheric CO2 was still increasing and the rate of rise was still increasing. I asked them how this could be happening--if emissions were the cause of atmospheric CO2 increase. They said we must wait another 470 years for anything we do with emissions to show an effect. Anything we do with CO2 emissions has not and will not have any effect on atmospheric CO2 for hundreds of years. However, the residence time for atmospheric carbon dioxide is 150 years. This is why everything we have done to lower emissions of CO2 has had zero effect on the atmospheric CO2 rise. https://cctruth.org/residence_time.pdf Below are the constraints I used. Even at average residence time of 100

years Mauna Loa never stays low.

Facts

Residence time was 5 years, Now more than 150 years. Recently I sent out a survey email to 400 climate change scientists about atmospheric CO2 residence time. Most scientists said 200-400 years. One scientist sent me his research of published papers, which show residence time from 150 years to 700 years.

Residence Time (Years)	Author	Year
700	Allen	2009
610	Zickfeld	2013
500	Matthews	2008
300	Plattner	2008
270	Cao	2010
230	Zickfeld	2012
220	Solomon	2012
220	Knutti	2012
210	Gillett	2011
180	Frolicher	2010
150	Hare	2006

https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.10 02/2017JD028121

Assumptions

Keep current carbon emissions rise at 0.3 gt/yr (current)

Reduction in 45% of fossil fuel emissions by 2030 Decreases of carbon emissions will be offset by increases in population Atmospheric CO2 stays the same slope. (Not increasing). However, rate of rise is increasing. Current rate is almost 3 ppm increase per year. At 100 years no more oil so CO2 emissions drop by 55% Atmospheric CO2 lowers to a minimum at year 2650 and then increases. We never reach equilibrium.

Even at a residence time of 100 years, atmospheric CO2 never lowers.

Constraints for this graph. 45% reduction in fossil fuel CO2 emissions by 2030 55% reduction in fossil fuel CO2 emissions by 2130 due to depletion of those fuels. 2030 45% reduction in the rate of rise of Atmospheric CO2. 2130 45% reduction in CO2 concentration 2230 55% reduction in CO2 concentration and rate.

This is because we have massive loss of photosynthesis consumption. Globalforestwatch.org/map

Another way to look at residence time is a signature from past events, which lowered CO2 emissions. For example, the oil embargo in the 1970's, multiple recessions and the big worldwide recession in 2009. The current COVID-19 pandemic. These are examples of lowered worldwide emissions. Below is the current graph of Mauna Loa CO2. You can clearly see no signature from these events.

On Netflix, please watch "kiss the ground" movie. It clearly explains why we cannot lower atmospheric CO2 by working on emissions of CO2.

Sea Level Rise (or lack thereof)

https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/ Twenty Ph. D's and I uploaded comments on Working Group 1 second order draft for AR6. https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.

Sea Level Change data is unreliable. The satellite NOAA uses, (the Jason-3) has a minimum resolution of 25 mm. They say they are measuring a 3mm rise per year by measuring a location every 10 days. When we measure anything below minimum resolution, the data reliability drops exponentially below 50% of the minimum resolution. I put them in the document review for WG I AR6 for next year. I know the tide gauges tell the truth and show

almost no sea level change. DOI : doi.org/10.33140/JMSRO.02.01.06 Review Article The Views of Three Sea Level Specialists, Mörner NA,

Wysmuller T and Parker

A https://www.opastonline.com/jmsro-volume-2-issue1-year-2019/www.opastonline.com J Mari Scie Res Ocean, 2019 Volume 2 | Issue 1 See this document:

A movie called Climate Hustle II will come out October 2020 and show this.

In addition, the European satellite has a 1 mm minimum resolution and it shows the same sea level rise as the tide gauges at 1.06 mm/yr

The Jakobshavn Glacier in Greenland has grown for the third year in a row. This is the large one Al Gore and others have falsely said would melt and cause the oceans to rise 15 feet. https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/145185/maj or-greenland-glacier-is-growing Tide gauge data:

https://sealevel.info/MSL_weighted.php?g_date=1910/ 1-2019/12&c_date=1910/12019/12&s_date=1910/12019/12&id=154,%20202,%20155,%20163,%20158,%20 188,%2012

Ocean Acidity

Ocean acidity (or lack thereof. Tony Heller shows how the ocean acidity is the same as it's always been in this video. Ocean stupidifcation

Net Zero

The document uses a term Net Zero with no definition.

We wrote the world's first atmospheric CO2 equilibrium manuscript is peer reviewed and published in worlds top climate change journal by impact factor. Equilibrium Paper NetzeroCO2e=8.6gt/yr.

Truth about Al Gore

Web search “Club of Rome”. This will tell you everything you need to know about the ignorance of Al Gore.

The assertion that 97% of scientists agree with the IPCC is wrong! This high consensus was touted because the three hundred manuscripts published between 2009 and 2013 were chosen for review on the basis of their seeming conformity to a certain point of view. Rejected for the review and survey of scientists were the more than seven hundred manuscripts written by scientists who had different statistics and conclusions from the ones that were wanted. Therefore, the agreeing part is 33%. We are 67%ers.

Discovery: Reduction in

Photosynthesis Correlation to Atmospheric CO2 Increase. 65 more conferences have invited me to present this. I have not accepted any invites because we have no funding.

I sent these statistics to all 220 IPCC scientists by email.

Not one of them objected to the statistics. Atmospheric CO2 is a binary system statistically. The two causes are CO2 emissions and loss of photosynthesis. Each cause is multi-variate. We have had mostly flat human emissions (0.3 GT/yr vs. 0.6 GT/yr) since 2014. However, atmospheric CO2 is still going up, and the rate of rise is increasing. In 2018, the Rxy correlation coefficient was 0.73 and not statistically significant (not cause and effect). In 2019 it is now 0.63 and dropping. The data is here:

Carbon Dioxide Does Not Freeze in the Atmosphere In the mesosphere, the pressure is 1 millibar. At this pressure, CO2 freezes at -100°C. The temperature in the mesosphere is -90°C.

This 2010 graph is the only one you will see online. They do not want you to know how emissions of CO2 have slowed down worldwide.

Carbon dioxide emissions correlate to 363 ppm and is a contributor, not the cause of the rise.

This tank model is like your kitchen sink. Standing water in the sink is increasing residence time. By this model, we need to shut the input and fix the drain. We cannot shut the input because the “natural” emissions are 20 billion tons/yr. We must increase photosynthesis.

The oscillation at Mauna Loa starts as a very strong signal in South America and then fans out larger and larger until Barrow’s Alaska. The countries in South America burn the Amazon Rainforest, the densest forest in the world, from October/ November through May of the next year. Since 1950, an average of 30 million acres per year have been deforested and burned. So much CO2 has been released that the trees and plants have grown too fast and died. This massive decay is what caused the Amazon Rainforest to switch to an oxygen sink and carbon dioxide producer.

Hundreds of papers have been published on this.

Currently, the Amazon output is 15 GTyr-1 of CO2.

Mauna Loa cycles

globalforestwatch.org 390->8.6 gtyr-1

The Amazon Rainforest deforestation is a 0.98 cause and effect to the rise of carbon dioxide since 1957.

Amazon Rainforest Rxy =-0.99 The loss of oxygen worldwide is a 0.99 cause and effect to the destruction of 2 billion acres of the Amazon Rainforest since 1950! The correct solution is to

stop non-sustainable deforestation of those forests like the Indian and Amazon Rainforests and plant 200 billion native trees and shrubs.

India stopped deforestation and is planting trees!

China is planting billions of trees!

Pakistan planted 1 billion trees in 2018, 2 billion more in 2019, and they will plant 8 billion more in the next four years! Peru stopped deforestation in 2020! Already planting 3 billion trees and the global garden greening atmospheric CO2 minimum on October 4th was 407.51 ppm. Dr Pieter Tans said it should be 408.6+/- 0.5. For November the rise was -0.45 ppm. (11/1= 411.02, 4/20=410.57), November of 2017 it was 2.7 ppm rise. November 2018 1.85 ppm rise. 8 billion more trees scheduled in the next 4 years. We can easily plant 100 billion trees in the USA and in 10 years will consume an extra 10 billion tons annually.

Effect of 24+ billion trees planted in the last 48 months.

This drone can plant 40,000 trees per day.

I put in a complaint to Department of Commence Inspector general about Mauna Loa CO2 fraud. They started investigating 4/24/20. Please download the rain-forest stop document and follow it weekly. Over 1000 people have been doing this since last June. To lower atmospheric Carbon dioxide quickly.

1. Put pressure on Brazil and other Amazon rain-forest countries to stop deforestation ASAP. Also stop the biomass burning that puts 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. This has caused 50ppm of the recent rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. Then after 10 years finish burning what is needed at 10% per year for 10 years.

2. Provide space where public can come and plant trees and shrubs. All government-owned lands. Very small cost. Need website with document for each planting area.

3. Plant shrubs in all freeway medians and sides. This is revenue plus in a two-year cycle. Plant native shrubs at a minimal spacing so all light is used in photosynthesis. This will take in 1 ton of CO2 emissions per acre per year right at the source. The space would not need to be mowed every week in the summer.

4. Get schools involved and planting massive number of trees and shrubs. In their property and the government property as in 1 above.

5. Parks can add trees and shrubs.

6. Close any climate change research group. Not needed, unless doing photosynthesis work.

7. Tax incentive for business to plant trees and shrubs.

8. Wild fire attention. Get a retainer for the 747 plane and use it from the start on any wild fire.

Forest management by “strip logging” which was developed by Oregon State Forestry. This strip 30 to 60 yards wide (depending on the height of the trees) will provide ongoing logging opportunities, making these cuts. The side trees and shrubs will naturally reseed these cuts. These seeds are matched genetically to the local soil and climate. They grow much faster because of this. No reseeding is needed or desired. These cuts make an excellent firebreak.

We have an experiment on US 26 eastbound just west of Portland, Oregon. A permit obtained from Oregon Department of Transportation. These sensors are NIST certified and calibrated within one part per million. Graph 9 shows the rate of rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide less than 3 ppm/yr. The blue line represents the difference between the treed area and a non-treed area. Each location has a wind directional measurement. This measurement can confirm bad data from crosswind for example. This experiment proves we can plant native shrubs and trees by roads and freeways instead of grass. This freeway has 161,000 autos per day on it, and approximately 460 auto exit (Sylvan exit 71) per day between the two sensor locations. The final day of testing was 6/12/2021.

Procedure:

Place sensors at 6am daily for two weeks every other month for one year.

Pick up sensors at 7pm and analyze the data.

Put SD memory card from sensor into computer. Import the data into an Excel spreadsheet.

Repeat for other sensor.

For each 10 seconds subtract the treed area from the non-tree area.

Sort data for “smallest to largest” from subtraction result.

Remove negative numbers in the subtraction result.

The negative numbers are from wind gusts. We tracked this many times.

Calculate average for the day. Repeat.

Things to note in the graph. At no time did the blue line go below the red line. On December 20th, a very dark and rainy day the difference was 9 ppm. In April through June we had very little rain. The graph shows this as lower difference. For photosynthesis, we need these things, light, vegetation, moisture and carbon dioxide. Experiment Summary: This experiment proves we can plant native trees and shrubs instead of grass and they will eventually consume all the carbon dioxide from the vehicles. This is applicable for ±50° from the equator.

$6CO_2 + 6H_2O + \lambda \rightarrow C_6H_{12}O_6 + 6O_2$

The second year finished on 5/16/2022 with over 4 million more data points. This moved the experiment from Theory to Scientific Law!

Texas needs to find native shrubs to plant in these locations.

Native western Oregon plants.

Sweet bay

Photinia

Juniper

Knick

Leaf holly

Red twig Dogwood

Where to plant

Medians Photinia, Sweet bay, Leaf holly, Red twig Dogwood

On/Off ramps Photinia, Sweet bay, Juniper, Knick

References.

1. https://cctruth.org/comments_ar6wg1_sod.xlsx was uploaded 4/30/2020.
2. DOI:10.1007/s11069-012-0159-8
3. https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/the-essential-role-of-photosynthesis-in-defining-net-zero-carbon-dioxide-emissions-for-equilibrium-calculations.pdf
4. https://cctruth.org/NOAA_Mauna.pdf
5. https://cctruth.org/ WGII_SOD_Ar6.xlsx
6. https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/global.html
7.