

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

Climate Change Truth Inc.
research@cctruth.org, class action
members.
Plaintiffs

Case

**COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT,
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, AND DAMAGES**

Demand for Jury Trial

v.

Greg Abbott, in his personal capacity and
his official capacity of Governor of the
State of Texas
norma.magirl@gov.texas.gov, **Jon**
Niermann commissr@tceq.texas.gov, in
his official capacity as executive director of
Commission on Environmental Quality,
Marc Williams
amanda.martinez@txdot.gov his official
capacity as executive director, **Department of**
Transportation
Defendants.

INTRODUCTION

Cause of Action.

ArtI.S8.C3.7.1 Overview of Dormant Commerce Clause

1. The Dormant Commerce Clause involves not federal power to act but the restrictions on state power that are inherent in the Commerce Clause. There is no actual “Dormant Commerce Clause” found in the Constitution. Rather, the restrictions on state action have been inferred

by the Supreme Court from the Commerce Clause.

2. You will recall that in *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1 (1824), the issue involved a state-granted monopoly that conflicted with a federal licensing law for the operation of steamboats. Ogden's New York monopoly, according to the Court would render the federal law impotent in New York, and therefore the Supremacy Clause required the Court to enforce the federal law.
3. The Environmental Protection Agency is the only agency to regulate greenhouse gases. By the Dormant Commerce Clause only the federal government can regulate greenhouse gases. However, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled against them. They incorrectly used the Clean Air Act of 1967 which said for regulation the chemical must be toxic. No greenhouse gas is toxic. This is Exhibit 3.

This complaint presents the following five questions concerning Cap and Trade policies in the Public Law 117 - 58 - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Executive Order 13990 86 Fed. Reg. 7037 Section 40434a; relating to protecting public health and the environment and restoring science to tackle the climate crisis.

1. Do the Cap and Trade policies, mentioned above, provide the right answers to correct climate change. The answer is, no. There is no climate crisis. See exhibits I and II. More than 2000 PhD's at 18 Climate Change conferences on cctruth.org know and agree with this.
2. Are Solar Panels and Windmills the correct solution? The answer is: no.
There is nothing green in the green new deal unless you like rolling blackouts! Solar panels don't work at night or with snow on them. Windmills are not the solution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JYHX-lb3Q5Q>

3. Are The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports using correct science? The answer is: no.

a. More than 2000 PhD's from 18 climate change conferences know and agree with this.

4. Are the IPCC reports based on loosely referenced manuscripts with little or no scientific value?

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports which are deliberate science fiction. Unless any scientist believes writing loosely referenced manuscripts and publishing them in a journal where the chief editor had a PhD in political science and then referencing them in the IPCC reports is science. That is not science. See chapter 13 in the college textbook on ccruth.org. See exhibits I and II.

The answer is: yes.

5. Has the variable NetZeroCO2e ever been calculated? The answer is: yes.

<https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/the-essential-role-of-photosynthesis-in-defining-net-zero-carbon-dioxide-emissions-for-equilibrium-calculations.pdf>

“In this research manuscript, the authors seek to answer four essential questions relative to the current climate change conversation now underway globally: (Q1) what is the numerically defined goal for annual Net Zero Carbon Dioxide Emissions in gigatonnes essential for global atmospheric homeostasis? (Q2) Why is atmospheric CO2 rising even though recent data support that CO2 emissions have the rate of rise lowered by 50% since 2014 globally? (Q3) Are CO2 cap and trade policies the best immediate intervention, or does globally increasing photosynthesis offer a more rapid and better long-term solution to climate change? (Q4) What strategies can be employed to have the greatest positive impact over the upcoming crucial twelve-year

period? Nothing absorbs carbon dioxide out of our atmosphere like photosynthesis, and therein lies the most under-discussed solution to the greatest problem of our time. A single hectare of healthy Amazon Rainforest can sequester up to 100 tons of CO₂yr⁻¹ due to photosynthesis. And the fast-growing Empress Tree (*Paulownia tomentosa*) not only grows ten to twenty feet tall in its first year, but a single hectare of these trees can sequester up to 103 tons of CO₂yr⁻¹ due to photosynthesis [1]. Prior to the Industrial Revolution and long before global deforestation devastated Earth's delicate atmospheric ecosystem, forests around the world are estimated to have consumed up to 400 billion tons of CO₂yr⁻¹. As of 2019, that has been reduced dramatically as global forests consume less than 10 billion tons of CO₂yr⁻¹ with photosynthesis [2]. NetZeroCO₂E=8.6 gt/yt (billion tons per year) photosynthesis."

The American Meteorological Society (AMS) and Nature Journals started predatory journals lists. These lists are not predatory. The AMS and Nature Journals charge \$3000-4000 to publish a manuscript. Most of the journals on the predatory journals list charge \$300-\$400 to publish a manuscript! Furthermore, the well respected and renowned journal International Chemical Engineering is on the predatory journal lists!

Relief Sought

1. Stop Cap and Trade Policies. Give all money collected so far to Climate Change Truth Inc.
2. Stop clear cutting forests. Strip logging is sustainable and makes a perfect fire break around 20,000 acres. Clear cutting is not sustainable.
3. Remove ethanol from fuel. Ethanol provides less power and less miles per gallon.

Therefore, more pollution.

4. Injunction to stop NOAA Mauna Loa from making manual increases in daily worldwide carbon dioxide data. https://cctruth.org/NOAA_Mauna.pdf.

For Immediate Release

02 February 2022 Portland, Oregon

Announcing the Publication of the First Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Equilibrium Manuscript to Define NetZeroCO_{2e} in *The Journal of Earth Science & Climatic Change*, the number one Climate Change Journal rated by impact factor! <https://www.omicsonline.org/climatic-change-journals-conferences-list.php>

<https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/the-essential-role-of-photosynthesis-in-defining-netzero-carbon-dioxide-emissions-for-equilibrium-calculations.pdf>

White D, Ealy H, Martin, K (2022) The Essential Role of Photosynthesis in Defining Net Zero Carbon Dioxide Emissions for Equilibrium Calculations. *J Earth Sci Clim Change*, 13: 602.

Dave White's team research manuscript has received high marks from peer reviewers and has been published in the top-most climate change journal by impact factor.

Dave White's team includes himself, Henry Ealy Ph.D. and Katherine Martin, research assistant.

Dave White, a chemical engineer with a Master's level (461) study in statistics, is a founding member of [Climate Change Truth](#). CCTruth is an organization dedicated to finding the answer to civilization's most pressing problem. His organization has worked to stop the destruction of rainforests in India and Peru, recognizing the urgency of preserving photosynthesis levels.

Dave White's teamwork, *The Essential Role of Photosynthesis in Defining Net Zero Carbon Dioxide Emissions for Equilibrium Calculations* has completed the peer review process, receiving comments such as:

- **The team explains how cap and trade policies would have zero effect on the rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide because the equilibrium point is too low. The strategy with the most positive effect on lowering atmospheric CO₂ is by increasing photosynthesis.**
- **There are many positive points which are useful for everyone to understand and learn from. The reviewers found the manuscript very impressive.**
- **[Additional comments can be found here.](#)**

COMPLAINT

Dave White has painstakingly shown that some of today's most popular strategies for addressing climate change do not and will not work. As his research shows, the key is to enhance photosynthesis by increasing forestation. The need for more trees and shrubs is urgent and planting needs to accelerate immediately.

Key Findings


Dave White's team's groundbreaking research has found that the northern hemisphere forests only consume 2.6 billion tons of carbon dioxide per year through photosynthesis. They also note that all the southern hemisphere forests have become oxygen sinks and carbon dioxide producers due to organic decay. The current forestation level is insufficient for the Earth's needs. Other findings include:

Ocean photosynthesis is decreasing.

The tropospheric carbon dioxide is diffusing to the exosphere, not the ocean. The ocean is not a sink for carbon dioxide.

https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/co2/story/OA+Observations+and+Data?fbclid=IwAR0-xbOB-uGS0GOsX9Yq_2Pem5Airvttxl6fypsikuNDcElGR7qGPiIHNFM

Ocean SOCAT (vessel carbon dioxide) data is from vessels with carbon dioxide sensors. No relationship between Ocean and atmospheric carbon dioxide.



- Planting native trees and shrubs near roads (where applicable) will consume all the carbon dioxide from vehicles in ten years.

On Netflix please watch 2 movies. Kiss the Ground and Seaspiracy

COMPLAINT

3 **18th Climate Change Conference.** Plenary address. The Essential Role of Photosynthesis in Defining Net Zero Carbon Dioxide Emissions for Equilibrium Calculations

Well documented, well received science about climate change.

https://cctruth.org/Plenary_VSET_04_23_22.pdf

Video here: https://cctruth.org/Plenary_VSET_04_23_22.mp4

67 more conferences have invited me to present the most expedient way to lower atmospheric carbon dioxide to 330 ppm by 2031! Cctruth.org has had **over 54 million visitors in the last 24 months.**

Call to action on the home page!

On Netflix please watch Kiss the ground movie, Atmospheric carbon dioxide never lowers working on emissions of carbon dioxide.

Slide 2 through 27. Atmospheric carbon dioxide is not an emissions issue. It's a 97% loss of photosynthesis.

Slide 6. Emissions of carbon dioxide are not cause and effect. The graph used to say cause and effect has not been updated since 2012!

Slide 9 and 10. Average atmospheric carbon dioxide residence time is 150 years! No effect from any recession or emissions work for 150 years!

Slide 11. Atmospheric carbon dioxide never lowers working on emissions.

Slide 12. 90% of people on earth live in the northern hemisphere. 90% of our emissions would look completely different than the world wide data looks.

Slide 16. Atmospheric carbon dioxide is a drain (photosynthesis) issue.

Slide 21. The total carbon dioxide emissions worldwide is not 34 billion tons, it is closer to 50 billion.

There is no way to get from 50 to 8.6 billion tons!

We must increase photosynthesis!

Slide 24. loss of worldwide oxygen cycles, just like the carbon dioxide increase. They are tied together.

COMPLAINT

Slide 27. Today atmospheric carbon dioxide is 420 ppm. Increasing photosynthesis, from 8.6 billion tons, current level, to 80 to 100k billion tons per year, is lowering the atmospheric carbon dioxide to 330 ppm by 2031. Over 2000 PhD's agree with this.

Slide 29 through 33. Results of increasing photosynthesis.

Slide 34 Mauna Loa CO2 peaked in February this year for the first time!

Slide 35. State of Oregon sanctioned experiment which proves we can plant native trees and shrubs next to roads, and in 10 years they will consume all the carbon dioxide from the vehicles. This applies to +/-50 degrees latitude.

Slide 37. Atmospheric carbon dioxide doesn't freeze in the atmosphere!

Slide 38 to Slide 40. The Ocean is not a sink for atmospheric carbon dioxide!

Slides 41 Through 45. Our 23-30 scientific PhD review of The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports caused the Mitigation group (Jim Skea's) to put the statement used to say we need to lower emissions of carbon dioxide into the 5th paragraph of their executive summary (ES). This statement had zero references and was buried on page 90. Likewise, on page 100 their probability for their solution to work is 66%!

We have written a college textbook accepted by one of the most prestigious college book publishers.

The title is "Climate Crisis Changed. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports are science fiction!"

Slides 46 to 54. Sea level rise is 1.4 mm/yr. linear and not accelerating.


Slides 55-60 NiCE fix, SE USA storms not from Climate Change

CALL TO ACTION ON CCTRUTH.ORG.

4 California lawmakers are turning cap-and-trade into the slush fund critics long feared.

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-cap-and-trade-safe-drinking-waterbudget->

5 California has the most EV's of any state.



6 California's power grid has already had rolling blackouts. This article says "California has pushed hard to switch to solar and wind power while closing older gas-burning plants. That action has left the grid vulnerable in evenings when solar production fades. California Independent System Operator Chief Executive Officer Elliot Mainzer said Friday that, "consumer conservation to avoid outages may be needed for years."

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-10/california-orders-stage-2-grid-emergency-power-shortfalls-loom>

Plaintiffs Climate Change Truth and David White have 18 presentations on cctruth.org

which show atmospheric carbon dioxide is not an emissions issue. It is a loss of photosynthesis issue. Also Global sea rise is 1.4 mm/year linear and not accelerating.

David White along with 23-30 scientific PhD's participate in government and expert review of the IPCC reports and they find many errors in data and analysis, abandoning century held scientific principles. Case in point, the review scientific PHD's have caused the mitigation group of IPCC to make paragraph 5, of their report for AR6, to contain the statement Jim Skea which was we need to lower emissions of carbon dioxide. The statement had zero citations (references) which would this solution. This was buried on page 95 of their report. On page 101 we found a probability table.

““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” It shows their probability for a solution by lowering emissions of carbon dioxide work only 50-65% of the time. This in in Exhibits 1 and 2. Lowering emissions of carbon dioxide by 25% by 2030 will only lower our carbon dioxide to a level of 26 billion tons. We need to reach 8.6 billion tons to start the process of lowering atmospheric carbon dioxide. That means this IPCC model is unattainable factually and statistically.

PARTIES

- 1 Plaintiffs are scientists who follow the data and no other agenda.
- 2 **New information brings The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports into question. Exhibits 1 and 2 show this.**
- 3 **David White gave the 18th plenary address of the carbon dioxide equilibrium at a climate change conference in March 2022. We only have 8.6 billion tons of photosynthesis remaining per year in our world.**
- 4 **The average residence time for atmospheric carbon dioxide is 150 years. These are more than 160 scientific PhD's in 19 published manuscripts summarized in one manuscript.**
 - a. Unrealized Global Temperature Increase: Implications of Current Uncertainties, Schwartz, S. E. J. Geophys. Res. , 2018, doi: 10.1002/2017JD028121.


D.	Residence Time (Years)	E.	Author	F.	Year
G.	>700	H.	Allen	I.	2009
J.	610	K.	Zickfeld	L.	2013
M.	500	N.	Matthews	O.	2008
P.	300	Q.	Plattner	R.	2008
S.	270	T.	Cao	U.	2010
V.	230	W.	Zickfeld	X.	2012
Y.	220	Z.	Solomon	AA.	2012
BB.	220	CC.	Knutti	DD.	2012
EE.	210	FF.	Gillett	GG.	2011
HH.	180	II.	Frolicher	JJ.	2010
KK.	150	LL.	Hare	MM.	2006

Another way to look at residence time is a signature from past events, which lowered carbon dioxide emissions.

Oil embargo in the 1970's

Multiple recessions

Worldwide recession in 2009.



COVID-19 pandemic.

You can clearly see no signature from these events. Take the oil embargo of the 1970's.

There was a national shortage of fuel and costs were prohibitive. Yet, on the graph

below, you can see that there is no dip in atmospheric CO₂. It's not caused by fossil fuel burning.

The Court should issue an order that the State's cap and trade policy is the wrong solution, an order prohibiting the State of Texas from enforcing its policy, and a judgment for damages.

Causes of Action.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Stop Cap and Trade policies which won't do any good. The average residence time of atmospheric carbon dioxide is 150 years. No effect from any recession or COVID. Pay \$30 million to Climate Change Truth Inc. cctruth.org

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Stop clear cutting forests. These practices are not sustainable!

Change to strip logging around every 20,000 acres of Texas forest. This is sustainable logging.

COMPLAINT

Most of the trees on the side of the stripped area will re-seed the stripped area with native species for that microclimate.

Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Remove ethanol from fuel. Ethanol in fuel causes much less shelf life and 10% less fuel economy. http://www.fuel-testers.com/expiration_of_ethanol_gas.html

<https://www.bellperformance.com/blog/the-disadvantages-of-adding-ethanol-to-your-fuel>

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF


INJUNCTION

Stop NOAA Mauna Loa from making manual increases in daily worldwide carbon dioxide data. https://cctruth.org/NOAA_Mauna.pdf More fraud by NOAA below.


What NOAA is covering up is that the daily worldwide carbon dioxide is not going up, it's going down. The reason it's going down is the Indian rainforest and the forests in Peru have stopped their deforestations. White spoke to these countries' and they looked at the data at cctruth.org. 27 billion trees have been planted in the last five years, and this caused the peak to be in February, 2022 instead of May 2022.

Weekly average CO₂ at Mauna Loa

Week beginning on May 8, 2022: 421.13 ppm
 Weekly value from 1 year ago: 418.34 ppm
 Weekly value from 10 years ago: 397.38 ppm
Last updated: May 15, 2022



The enclosed area is manual adjustments. They are trying to make the peak at end of May like the past 70 years by manually adding ppm. In our experiment on US26E with two NIST certified sensors the no tree area has been around 405 ppm. This data is guaranteed by the US government!



The atmospheric winds keep carbon dioxide and all greenhouse gases equal concentration throughout the latitudes +/- 8 ppm. Our experiment with NIST certified sensors is at 46 degrees north. This makes the value in Portland about 6ppm lower.

COMPLAINT

NOAA Mauna Loa falsely says the current value is 422ppm. The NIST certified carbon dioxide sensor in the non-treed area shows between 404ppm and 394ppm daily. This is far outside the 416 valued predicted by NOAA!

Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff respectfully demands a jury trial of all issues triable to a jury in this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. A declaration that the State of Texas's cap and trade policy is the wrong solution;
- B. A preliminary injunction and permanent injunction;
- C. Damages;
- D. Attorney fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
- E. Such other and further relief as the court deems just;

Respectfully Dated: 12/17/2022



David White President of Climate

Change Truth Inc.

Exhibit I.

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.

Copied from <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/chapter-2/>

Executive Summary

This statement with no references! This is IPCC Mitigation group executive summary paragraph five for AR6.

The probability of reducing emissions by 45% to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide by 2030 is 66% Planting a tree is 100% probability.

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. Pathways that aim for limiting warming to 1.5°C by 2100 after a temporary temperature overshoot rely on large-scale deployment of carbon dioxide removal (CDR) measures, which are uncertain and entail clear risks. In model pathways with no or limited overshoot of 1.5°C, global net anthropogenic CO₂ emissions decline by about 45% from 2010 levels by 2030 (40–60% interquartile range), reaching net zero around 2050 (2045–2055 interquartile range). 1

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 (2065–2080 interquartile range). {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}

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.pdf . 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/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!



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)

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) ¹⁰³⁸, 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 ¹⁰³⁹	9	
	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	
				90

(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. Séférián, 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.

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	389.5 ^{2,8}	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 ₂ O)	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 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/10.1002/2017JD028121>


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/major-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,%2020155,%2020163,%2020158,%20188,%202012



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 stupidification](#)

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 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 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.

Recent Daily Average Mauna Loa CO₂


October 07:	408.20 ppm
October 06:	407.82 ppm
October 05:	408.00 ppm
October 04:	407.51 ppm
October 03:	407.53 ppm



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

Recent Daily Average Mauna Loa CO₂

March 13: 414.11 ppm
March 12: 414.11 ppm
March 11: 414.37 ppm
March 10: 413.78 ppm
March 09: 413.95 ppm
Last Updated: March 14, 2020



Hourly (red circles) and Daily (yellow circles) averaged CO₂ values from Mauna Loa, Hawaii for the last 31 days.



This drone can plant 40,000 trees per day.

I put in a complaint to Department of Commerce 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 reseeded 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.





**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

Exhibit 3

This email is bcc'd to thousands of scientists at the IPCC and EPA and NOAA. If the media doesn't write a story about this than these scientists will know the media is corrupt also.

Carbon dioxide is not pollution! Everyone breaths it out! This very much strengthens our legal argument for the class action lawsuits to stop cap and trade which can be seen on cctruth.org, lawsuit page. Exhibits 1 and 2 are our 23-30 PhD reviews of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports which are deliberate science fiction. Exhibit three is what the Supreme Court did to Environmental Protection agency (EPA) telling them they can't regulate greenhouse gases, see below. These are class action lawsuits and anyone can sign

up to be a class action member to share in the settlement proceeds when we win our case. These lawsuits range from \$26 million to \$232 billion dollars.

What the Supreme Court did to the corrupt Environment Protection Agency (EPA): The Clean Air Act of 1967 directed the EPA to tackle such issues as Acid Rain and others. It instructs the EPA to make a “toxic chemicals” list. Then any chemical the EPA wants to regulate in Section 111 subsection d must be on the toxic chemicals list.

The EPA in 2015 illegally used section 111 subsection d to go after greenhouse gases without putting them on the toxic chemicals list. Carbon dioxide is not toxic because human’s breath it out minute. Methane in the atmosphere is not in a high enough concentration to be toxic. Methane concentration is less than 2 part per billion. Every day you are breathing methane with no discernable negative effects on anyone’s health. That certainly doesn’t put it on the level of toxicity and therefore the EPA has no mandate to regulate it by law.

To address this breaking of the law by the EPA, Congress must start a congressional investigation and put the people who did this on trial. If Congress wants the EPA to regulate Greenhouse gases, then it needs to write another law. They need to remove the prior law and replace it with a law that allows the EPA to tax and confiscate citizen finances and property to regulate completely harmless gases. However, they need to keep the following scientific facts in mind when writing such legislation.

Greenhouse Gas	Emission band cm^{-1}	Radiation Flux W/m^2
H ₂ O Water vapor	All bands	303.8
CO ₂ Carbon dioxide	All bands	30.9-37.3
CH ₄ Methane	1200-1400	1.0-1.2
N ₂ O Nitrous Oxide	1200-1300	1.1-1.3
O ₃ Ozone	900-1100	3.0-3.3

Table 7.2 page 3 of http://irina.eas.gatech.edu/EAS8803_SPRING2012/Lec7.pdf

Calculating percent effect is for water vapor $303.8/344.2 * 100 = 88.26\%$

The 339.8 is the sum of these effects.

Water vapor is 89.4% ghg effect.

Carbon dioxide is 9.09%

Ozone is 0.88%

Nitrous Oxide is 0.32%

Methane is 0.29%

AR6 is this 2022 version of the IPCC faulty reports on Climate Change.

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.

Learn more about Greenhouse Gases here: [Greenhouse Gases - Climate Change Truth \(cctruth.org\)](https://cctruth.org)

On cctruth.org there exists a college textbook titled: Climate Crisis Changed The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports are deliberate science fiction.

Sustainability is a lie of the IPCC. Global sea rise is 1.4 mm/yr linear and not accelerating. See chapter 8. <https://cctruth.org/home/college-textbook/> Solar Panels and Windmills are not the solution <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JYHX-Ib3Q5Q> cctruth.org