

“This idea of equating climate deniers with scientific experts is a dangerous practice which frames the threat to our planet, our existence as an ongoing debate,” Klein Salamon added. “I don’t think sacrificing the future of our planet in exchange for a look of ‘objectivity’ is an even exchange. It’s one the coming generation will judge us on, if we don’t move with the urgency necessary to fight back against global warming and win.”

In other words, climate alarmists aren’t just calling for radical changes to America to stave off some hypothetical climate disaster — they’re also calling for opposing voices to be silenced. “Science” can only have one voice, and that voice must be Chicken Little.

The Climate Mobilization seized on a [Newsweek article](#) about a study from [Nature Communications](#). The study’s authors claimed that the U.S. news media gives “climate change deniers too much prominence by placing people with little understanding of the complexities involved in the same league as top scientists.”

“It’s time to stop giving these people visibility, which can be easily spun into false authority,” University of California Merced Professor Alex Petersen said in a statement. Petersen and his team traced the digital footprints of voices for and against climate alarmism across 100,000 media articles. They found that about half of mainstream outlets seek out “climate denying” experts.

Many outlets will present both sides of the issue, including one scientist echoing the climate alarmist mantra and another expert who disagrees — and who therefore must not be a real scientist, the article suggested.

“It’s not just false balance; the numbers show that the media are ‘balancing’ experts—who represent the overwhelming majority of reputable scientists—with the views of a relative handful of non-experts,” Professor LeRoy Westerling, the study’s author, said in a statement. “Most of the contrarians are not scientists, and the ones who are have very thin credentials. They are not in the same league with top scientists. They aren’t even in the league of the average career climate scientist.”

Yet the *Nature Communications* study notes that 224 of the 386 “climate change contrarians” quoted by the media have at least one publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals. The study did not mention how many of the “climate change scientists” quoted by the media had published articles, but the authors selected 224 of their papers and showed how their papers were more heavily cited.

If the professional world of climate science is dominated by the ideology of climate alarmism, it would make sense that climate alarmists are more heavily cited than climate skeptics. In January 2017, Judith Curry, former chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at Georgia Tech, resigned, [calling out](#) the alarmist ideology that increasingly dominates her field.

“I no longer know what to say to students and postdocs regarding how to navigate the CRAZINESS in the field of climate science,” Curry wrote. “Research and other professional activities are professionally rewarded only if they are channeled in certain directions approved by a politicized academic establishment — funding, ease of getting your papers published, getting hired in prestigious positions, appointments to prestigious committees and boards, professional recognition, etc.”

“How young scientists are to navigate all this is beyond me, and it often becomes a battle of scientific integrity versus career suicide (I have worked through these issues with a number of skeptical young scientists),” Curry wondered.

In other words, climate science is becoming an ideological echo chamber that rewards alarmism and silences dissenting voices, even when the dissenters are good scientists like Curry.

The study also parroted the blatantly false claim that there is a scientific consensus on the issue — citing the Cook study from 2013. The Cook study [notoriously misrepresented](#) the scientific literature to claim a 97 percent consensus, and activists continue to cite it as if it were gospel truth.

The study analyzed all published peer-reviewed academic research papers from 1991 to 2011 that use the terms “global warming” or

“global climate change.” Of the nearly 12,000 papers analyzed, the study discounted 7,930 — 66.4 percent — because they allegedly did not state a position. Then the study added up the papers it claimed endorsed man-made climate change and the papers it claimed opposed man-made climate change, and found that 97 percent of the papers *that stated a position* favored global warming.

But here’s the kicker: many scientists whose papers were included in the study complained that the papers were misinterpreted as supporting man-made global warming when they did not.

[Read full story here...](#)



Seattle Resolves To Launch Green New Deal

Seattle follows the lead from Los Angeles and New York to jump

headlong into Green New Deal mania to replace Capitalism and Free Enterprise with Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy. □ TN Editor Councilmember [Mike O'Brien](#) (District 6, Northwest Seattle) and his Council colleagues unanimously passed in an 8-0 vote [Resolution 31895](#) relating to a Green New Deal for Seattle.

The resolution calls for the passage of a federal Green New Deal, and affirms Seattle's commitments to "...ensuring that our City can effectively respond to the climate crisis, transition away from its dependency on fossil fuels, and protect our most vulnerable residents while building Seattle's climate resiliency."

"We have 10 years to radically transform our city and our economy to eliminate fossil fuels," said O'Brien. "If you don't think the climate crisis is on our front step, remember the reality that people are developing asthma because of our air quality. Our tribal communities are having to move due to rising sea levels. All of us have to deal with summers filled with smoke due to forest fires. This Green New Deal resolution alone won't solve the crisis, but I believe it is possible for Seattle to lead in solving the climate crisis by eliminating fossil fuel use in our city over the next decade and creating a clean economy."

O'Brien reiterated the dire need to take bold action during the August 5 [Council Briefing](#) and reminded his colleagues of the grave consequences of inaction during a [news conference](#) August 6.

"We cannot continue to fight climate change with soft action. We have to be bold," said Nancy Huizar, Climate Justice Organizer for Got Green. "Through canvassing efforts by Got Green, we heard our community's demands for fair green jobs, transit, healthcare and childcare, healthy food, and renewable energy. This resolution establishes these goals, and ensures our community's needs are being heard."

The Sierra Club [defines](#) the Green New Deal as mobilizing "vast public resources to help us transition from an economy built on exploitation and fossil fuels to one driven by dignified work and clean energy."

"Seattle is positioned to be a national leader in addressing climate change by setting the goal of being climate pollution-free by 2030," said

Matt Remle, a member of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and co-founder of Mazaska Talks. “Seattle is also setting a strong example by ensuring in its legislation its intent to work with local and regional indigenous tribes on assessing the impacts of climate change, and centering native voices when addressing those impacts.”

Selected highlights of the Resolution include making Seattle climate pollution-free by 2030; prioritizing public investments in neighborhoods that have historically been underinvested in and disproportionately burdened by environmental hazards and other injustices; exploring the creation of Free, Prior, and Informed consent policies with federally recognized tribal nations; and, creating a fund and establish dedicated revenue sources for achieving the Green New Deal that will be used to make investments in communities, along with an associated accountability body.

[Read full story here...](#)



Green New Deal Would Cost At Least \$250K Per Household In First Five Years

The Green New Deal is economic insanity except that it would fulfill the United Nation's long-held goal of completely destroying Capitalism and Free Enterprise. Out of the ashes, Technocracy will rise triumphant. □
TN Editor

According to a new study, the Green New Deal's implementation would cost the average American family a quarter of a million dollars during the first five years. The costs are even higher for Americans living in Alaska. The study did not even take into account significant parts of the Green New Deal, since they are impossible to calculate. After all, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) hasn't even introduced an actual bill, but only a [resolution calling for future bills](#). It's less a concrete plan and more a worldview statement justifying hundreds of future laws.

The study, jointly co-authored by the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) and Power the Future (PTF), analyzed the additional electricity demanded for various projects like decarbonizing the economy; the costs associated with shipping and logistics; the costs of new carbon-free vehicles; and the costs to retrofit every building in America. Just these four types of costs would add up to more than \$250,000 per household in the first five years, a conservative estimate.

"The Green New Deal is a radical blueprint to de-carbonize the American economy by refashioning how we grow food, move people and goods, source and distribute electricity, and build the structures where we live, work, and play. Our analysis shows that, if implemented, the Green New Deal would cost for American households at least tens of thousands of dollars annually on a permanent basis," CEI President and CEO Kent Lassman said in a statement.

"Perhaps that's why exactly zero Senate Democrats, including the resolution's 12 co-sponsors, voted for the Green New Deal when they

had the chance,” he quipped.

“Economists and experts have been warning us for months about the devastating effects of the Green New Deal, and now we have the numbers to prove it,” PTF Executive Director Daniel Turner said in a statement. “This study only calculates a fraction of the cost of Alexandria-Ocasio Cortez’s radical plan, which amounts to a socialist free-for-all with no regard for the American taxpayer.”

“No family should be forced to pay tens of thousands of dollars in the first year alone to fund AOC’s ideological wishlist. Thankfully, Americans see through the Green New Deal and are beginning to fight back,” he added.

CEI and PTF analyzed the estimated costs for households in five states — Alaska, Florida, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania. In every state except Alaska, the Green New Deal would cost a typical household more than \$70,000 in the first year of implementation, approximately \$45,000 for each of the next four years (adding up to \$250,000 for the first five years), and more than \$37,000 each year after that. In Alaska, the average family would pay more than \$100,000 in the first year, \$73,000 for the next four years, and more than \$67,000 each year afterward.

“Most provisions of the GND are so broad and open-ended that the list of potential programs necessary to implement the program is limited by the capacity of legislators to imagine a new government program,” the study notes. “Therefore, it is impossible to calculate the whole or maximum cost of the GND. However, other parts of the GND are more precise, sufficiently so that an approximate minimum cost estimate is available.”

[Read full story here...](#)



Democrats Apply Hegelian Dialectic To Green New Deal

Thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis. AOC scores a big victory by forcing the Democrat leadership to adopt any form of her Green New Deal, even if watered down from the original version. □ TN Editor

Leading Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives announced a plan Tuesday to introduce a new, more conservative alternative to the “Green New Deal,” the plan introduced earlier this year to great fanfare by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY).

The original [bill](#), proposed by Ocasio-Cortez and Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA) in February, calls for “meeting 100 percent of the power demand in the United States through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy source” through a “10-year national mobilization” — i.e. roughly by the year 2030. Ocasio-Cortez has also [suggested](#) the world only has 12 years before reaching a point of no return before the problem climate change becomes impossible to solve.

The new proposal to be backed by Democrat leadership, however, will set the goal as 2050 — twenty years later, according to [The Hill](#). It also assumes that 2050 is the point of no return — not sometime in the next

12 years.

The new proposal echoes early criticisms of the Green New Deal, such as those offered by former New York City mayor Michael Bloomberg, who said the party needed a plan that was more practical. “I’m a little bit tired of listening to things that are pie in the sky, that we never are going to pass or never are going to afford,” he said at the time, as [quoted](#) by the *Washington Examiner*.

The Hill quotes Democratic members of the Energy and Commerce Committee not-so-subtly criticizing Ocasio-Cortez’s plan. Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY), for example, said: “We can do any kind of whimsical thing but we have to do this in a way that includes conversations with stakeholders, their buy-in and their involvement in a consensus bill.”

[Read full story here...](#)

Green New Deal Activists Glue Themselves To Capitol

They chanted, “What do we want? Green New Deal! When do we want it? Now!” This radical global group, Extinction Rebellion, now has chapters in 45 countries, all calling for the Green New Deal. □ TN Editor On Tuesday evening, members of the Washington, D.C., chapter of Extinction Rebellion superglued themselves to each other and to the passages connecting the Capitol to the Rayburn and Cannon office buildings, where House members have their offices. The protesters, who are part of an international group that uses nonviolent civil disobedience tactics to advocate for action on climate change, aimed to confront House members on their way to floor votes.

Many of the protesters, who did not expect the protest to last longer than 15 minutes, remained glued for more than two hours, alongside

dozens of demonstrators who rallied as a distraction. They wore signs over their shirts that said “Declare Climate Emergency” and chanted: “What do we want? Green New Deal! When do we want it? Now!” Capitol police asked bystanders and reporters to move back and, after three warnings, kicked everyone out — except, of course, those who were glued. They arrested 13 activists, [according](#) to Extinction Rebellion, around 8:30 p.m.

Members of Congress, for the most part, ignored the protesters. Rep. Jim Banks, R-Ind., former vice chair of the House Subcommittee on Environment, mocked the group on Twitter, posting a video of himself appearing to duck under a protester’s arm to get through with the note, “...Supergluing yourself to a door is a very dumb way to protest.”

The climate activism group, which was formally launched in the United Kingdom last October and has iterations in 45 countries, uses disruptive acts of civil disobedience to call on lawmakers around the world to treat the climate crisis with the urgency it deserves. They’ve blocked traffic, stood on trains, staged “die-ins,” climbed buildings, and [gotten half-naked](#). Because the group has no single leader, there’s no good estimate of how big the movement is in the United States, but the demonstrations it’s held in New York City have attracted hundreds.

Extinction Rebellion U.S. has [four demands](#), which include the reduction of carbon emissions to net zero by 2025 and the creation of a citizens’ assembly to oversee the “bold, swift and long-term changes necessary” to tackle the crisis. On Tuesday, protesters were specifically calling for the immediate passage of the joint resolution for the U.S. to declare the climate crisis an official emergency.

[Read full story here...](#)



Green New Deal Scam Destroyed By New Scientific Study On Global Warming

AOC, Justice Democrats, New Green Deal zealots and Technocrats everywhere will grind their teeth over this new research. The scientists concluded, ***“anthropogenic climate change does not exist in practice.”*** □ TN Editor

A new scientific study could bust wide open deeply flawed fundamental assumptions underlying controversial climate legislation and initiatives such as the Green New Deal, namely, the degree to which ‘climate change’ is driven by natural phenomena vs. man-made issues measured as carbon footprint. **Scientists in Finland found “practically no anthropogenic [man-made]climate change” after a series of studies.**

*“During the last hundred years the temperature increased about 0.1°C because of carbon dioxide. **The human contribution was about 0.01°C**”, the Finnish researchers bluntly state in [one among a series](#) of papers.*

This has been **collaborated by a team at Kobe University in Japan**, which has furthered the Finnish researchers' theory: *"New evidence suggests that high-energy particles from space known as galactic cosmic rays affect the Earth's climate by increasing cloud cover, causing an 'umbrella effect',"* the just published study has found, a summary of which has been released in the journal [Science Daily](#). The findings are hugely significant given this 'umbrella effect' — an entirely natural occurrence — could be **the prime driver of climate warming, and not man-made factors**.

The scientists involved in the study are most concerned with the fact that current climate models driving the political side of debate, most notably the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) climate sensitivity scale, fail to incorporate this crucial and potentially central variable of increased cloud cover.

"The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has discussed the impact of cloud cover on climate in their evaluations, but this phenomenon has never been considered in climate predictions due to the insufficient physical understanding of it," comments Professor Hyodo in [Science Daily](#). "This study provides an opportunity to rethink the impact of clouds on climate. When galactic cosmic rays increase, so do low clouds, and when cosmic rays decrease clouds do as well, **so climate warming may be caused by an opposite-umbrella effect.**"

In their related paper, [aptly titled](#), "No experimental evidence for the significant anthropogenic [man-made] climate change", the Finnish scientists find that low cloud cover **"practically" controls global temperatures** but that **"only a small part"** of the increased carbon dioxide concentration is anthropogenic, or caused by human activity.

The following is a key bombshell section in one of the studies conducted by Finland's [Turku University team](#):

We have proven that the GCM-models used in IPCC report AR5 cannot compute correctly the natural component included in the observed global temperature. The reason is that the models fail to derive the influences of low cloud cover fraction on the global

*temperature. A too small natural component results in a too large portion for the contribution of the greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide. That is why 6 J. KAUPPINEN AND P. MALMI IPCC represents the climate sensitivity more than one order of magnitude larger than our sensitivity 0.24°C. **Because the anthropogenic portion in the increased CO2 is less than 10 %, we have practically no anthropogenic climate change. The low clouds control mainly the global temperature.***

This raises urgent questions and central contradictions regarding current models which politicians and environmental groups across the globe are using to push radical economic changes on their countries' populations.

Conclusions from both the Japanese and Finnish studies strongly suggest, for example, that Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's "drastic measures to cut carbon emissions" which would ultimately require [radical legislation changes to "remake the U.S. economy"](#) would not only potentially bankrupt everyone but simply wouldn't even work, at least according to the new Finnish research team findings.

To put AOC's "drastic measures" in perspective — based entirely on the fundamental assumption of the monumental and disastrous impact of human activity on the climate — consider the following [conclusions from the Finnish studies](#):

*"During the last hundred years the temperature increased about 0.1°C because of carbon dioxide. **The human contribution was about 0.01°C.**"*

[Read full story here...](#)



New York State Lawmakers Set To Mandate Green Economy

Political madness and rampant deception have suckered the entire State of New York into creating its own private version of AOC's Green New Deal. It will cost taxpayers trillions in wasted capital and in increased living expenses. □ TN Editor

Gov. Andrew Cuomo (D) said yesterday he has reached an agreement with legislative leaders over a bill to slash New York's greenhouse gas emissions, setting the stage for one of the most significant state climate victories since President Trump took office.

The announcement, coming just days before the close of the legislative session, represented a big victory for climate activists, who have spent three years pushing for major legislation to curb greenhouse gases in the Empire State.

Lawmakers were still working on final amendments yesterday, but the outlines of the deal were becoming clear. The [legislation](#) calls for reducing emissions by 40% from 1990 levels by 2030 and 85% by 2050. The remaining 15% of emissions would be offset, making the state carbon neutral. The bill would also require that all electricity generation come from carbon-free sources by 2040. A Climate Action Council would

be established to ensure the state meets its targets.

“I believe we have an agreement, and I believe it is going to pass,” Cuomo said in a [radio interview](#) on WAMC.

The comment ended months of speculation over the fate of climate legislation in New York. Democratic lawmakers, who seized complete control of state government when they took over the state Senate last fall, had been pushing a bill called the “Climate and Community Protection Act.” The bill would spend 40% of the state’s clean energy revenues on energy efficiency measures and renewable installations in disadvantaged communities.

That drew repeated public objections from Cuomo, who said he wanted to ensure that environmental revenue was spent on environmental programs. Ultimately, the two sides settled on a compromise: At least 35% of revenues would go to disadvantaged communities. That funding could rise as high as 40%, which would amount to \$370 million in fiscal 2018-19.

“It was a question of the distribution of the funding,” Cuomo told WAMC. “I understand the politics on these issues. Everyone wants to make all these advocacy groups happy. Taxpayers’ money is taxpayers’ money. And if it’s taxpayers’ money for an environmental purpose, I want to make sure it’s going to an environmental purpose.

“This transformation to a new green economy is very expensive. We don’t have the luxury of using funding for political purposes.”

Business interests had urged Cuomo and Democratic lawmakers to slow down, saying the legislation threatened 40,000 manufacturing jobs in the state. The Business Council of New York State [called](#) zero carbon emissions “unrealistic.”

But Democratic lawmakers forged ahead, working through the weekend to iron out a deal with Cuomo before a filing deadline for legislation Sunday. They argued that the risks of climate change, coupled with the benefits of a green energy economy, outweighed the potential costs.

“It means that on Father’s Day, when I see my grandchildren next year, I’ll have a lot less uncertainty about their future than I did yesterday morning,” said Democratic Assemblyman Steve Englebright, a champion of the climate legislation. “It means we are going to be in the vanguard among states, tackling a problem that will affect every jurisdiction here and around the globe. New York will lead the way.”

State Sen. Todd Kaminsky (D) said New York’s action would send a major signal to markets, helping companies plan for a cleaner future. But ultimately, he said, lawmakers were responding to voters.

“Our constituents told us, ‘Don’t come back without doing something on climate,’” Kaminsky said. “The future is now. I think we’ve taken that important step.”

‘Policy mandate with teeth’

Republican control of the state Senate meant climate policy in New York had been centered in the governor’s office until this year. Cuomo has pumped out executive orders banning hydraulic fracturing, calling for the closure of the state’s remaining coal plants in 2020 and targeting a 40% reduction in emissions by 2030, among other things.

The legislation enshrines many of Cuomo’s targets into law, ensuring they will outlast the current governor. The new Climate Action Council would be required to issue recommendations on how to install 6 gigawatts of distributed solar by 2025, 9 GW of offshore wind by 2035 and 3 GW of energy storage by 2030.

[Read full story here...](#)



The Atlantic: The Green New Deal Has Already Won

The Green New Deal propaganda bomb has significantly moved the entire Democrat field to the far left, and forcing many Republicans into a compromise position to adopt elements of it. The Ocasio-Cortez and the Justice Democrats have achieved more than they could have hoped for. □ TN Editor

It's remarkable: A [number of polls](#) suggest that Democratic voters now consider climate change [to be a top-tier issue](#), as important as health care. Perhaps even more remarkably, the party's presidential candidates seem to be taking that interest seriously. Jay Inslee has [staked his candidacy](#) on the issue; Beto O'Rourke has [used a climate proposal](#) to revive his flagging campaign; and Elizabeth Warren has cited the warming planet across a wide set of her famous plans.

This week, Joe Biden joined their ranks, [releasing a lengthy climate plan](#) on his website. Though Reuters [teased his policy last month](#) as a

“middle ground” approach more moderate than the Green New Deal, the proposal looks pretty aggressive and sounds almost Bernie Sanders-esque in its ambition. What the United States needs, Biden says, is a “clean energy revolution.”

That revolution’s main objective: achieving a “100% clean energy economy” in the United States by the year 2050. It’s an ambitious goal, both more stringent and longer-sighted than what the previous Democratic White House—which Biden unfailingly calls the “Obama-Biden administration”—pledged under the Paris Agreement on climate change. To meet its old Paris target, the United States had to cut its annual carbon emissions by 1.3 percentage points every year from 2016 to 2025. To meet the 2050 goal, it must cut at more than double that rate—2.9 percentage points—for each of the next 31 years.

Of course, pending both a revision to [the Twenty-Second Amendment](#) and a surge of investment in brain-in-a-jar technology, Biden will not be president 31 years from now. He does not propose a specific binding mandate, such as a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade regime, to carry the country all the way to that mid-century goal.

Instead, Biden says he will work hard to point the federal ship of state toward climate action. He promises to implement a muscular set of executive orders on his first day in the White House. He will require public companies to disclose climate-incurred costs, deploy the federal government’s purchasing power on the side of clean energy, and restrict the release of the superpowerful greenhouse gas methane from oil and gas wells. He will also “require any federal permitting decision to consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change”—a policy that could have led to a different outcome in the Keystone XL and [Dakota Access pipeline battles](#).

Biden also promises to wring \$1.7 trillion in investment from Congress, “the largest-ever investment in clean energy research and innovation.” This money will fund a new technology-development program modeled on the Pentagon’s R&D agency, DARPA. This new “ARPA-C” will focus on the big and mostly unsolved challenges of decarbonization, such as electricity storage, advanced nuclear power, carbon capture, aviation

emissions, and zero-carbon cement and steel manufacturing. [The longtime Amtrak commuter](#) would also push Congress to “spark the second great railroad revolution,” catching up to high-speed rail in Europe and China. He says he will halve rail-travel times from New York to Washington and extend his old train line—the Northeast Corridor—into the “fast-growing South.”

Finally, Biden says he will use the various instruments of global governance, including the International Monetary Fund, to pressure China and India to reduce their carbon emissions.

I have not glossed all the details here; the full proposal exceeds 10,000 words—although, as [Business Insider](#) and [The Daily Caller](#) have reported, the plan appears to have lifted language directly from climate-advocacy groups in at least five different places. (Biden’s campaign says the error was inadvertent and that the proper citations have now been added.) [As the political scientist Leah Stokes has remarked](#), those lapses suggest that the policy was compiled hastily, almost in reaction to other candidates’ work.

[Read full story here...](#)



California Mulls Ban On Gas-Powered Cars

California legislators, already largely unplugged from reality, are unafraid of making any kind of wild legislation such as banning gas-powered automobiles entirely. This would ride on the back of the Green New Deal. □ TN Editor

California without gasoline-burning cars? The idea is starting to be floated.

A top regulator came close Thursday, but ultimately backed away from directly raising the notion of giving the boot to exhaust-belching automobiles, a staple of life in the freeway-happy Golden State for more than a century.

Speaking at an air-quality workshop in San Diego, Mary Nichols, chair of the California Air Resources Board, was expected to toss in the idea of killing off gas-powered cars based on her prepared remarks. They called for her to list ways in which the state can get tougher on pollution.

“That might mean, for example, tougher requirements for low-carbon fuels, looking at tighter health-protective regulations on California refineries, doubling down on our enforcement efforts on mobile and stationary sources — and might lead to an outright ban on internal-combustion engines,” according to the remarks obtained by Bloomberg News.

But when it came to actually delivering the remarks, the direct reference to a gas-engine ban was omitted. In closing the conference, Nichols said if the air can’t be cleaned fast enough, tougher measures like “fees, taxes and bans on certain types of vehicles” might be required. She added, “These are things that most of us don’t think is the right way to go.”

Nichols wasn’t proposing a gas-vehicle ban on a whim, said Simon Mui, senior scientist for the Natural Resources Defense Council. Rather, she

was reacting to steps that California may have to take to stay in compliance with toughening federal clean-air regulations. If the state, famous for its smoggy air, were to fall short, it would face sanctions.

“The feds have clearly put the states into a bind,” Mui said after attending the conference.

In California, a ban on the sale of internal-combustion cars is considered a fanciful idea. In fact, a bill to ban the sale of internal-combustion cars by 2040 was introduced in the California Legislature last year, though it didn’t get far.

“It’s time that we clear the path for emissions-free transportation and take significant steps to achieve our ambitious emissions reduction goals,” Assemblyman Phil Ting, a San Francisco Democrat, said in a statement at the time.

[Read full story here...](#)



LA Mayor Eric Garcetti Launches Green New Deal

Los Angeles is aspiring to become a City-State unto itself as it honors the Paris Climate Agreement and creates its own Green New Deal, delivering “environmental justice and equity through an inclusive green economy.” □ TN Editor

Mayor Eric Garcetti today released Los Angeles’ Green New Deal, which sets aggressive goals for the city’s sustainable future, tackles the climate emergency with accelerated targets, strengthens our economy and our middle class, and sets L.A. on course to be carbon neutral by 2050.

“Politicians in Washington don’t have to look across the aisle in Congress to know what a Green New Deal is — they can look across the country, to Los Angeles,” said Mayor Eric Garcetti. “With flames on our hillsides and floods in our streets, cities cannot wait another moment to confront the climate crisis with everything we’ve got. L.A. is leading the charge, with a clear vision for protecting the environment and making our economy work for everyone.”

L.A.’s Green New Deal is guided by four key principles: a commitment to uphold the Paris Climate Agreement; a promise to deliver environmental justice and equity through an inclusive green economy; a plan to ensure every Angeleno has the ability to join the green economy by creating pipelines to good paying, green jobs; and a determination to lead by example within City government, showing the world what an urban Green New Deal looks like in practice.

The Green New Deal leads with bold action to zero out Los Angeles’ main sources of harmful emissions: buildings, transportation, electricity, and trash. Our accelerated goals and new targets include:

- Building a zero carbon electricity grid — reaching an accelerated goal of 80% renewable energy supply by 2036 as we lead California toward 100% renewables by 2045.
- Creating a Jobs Cabinet to bring city, labor, educational, and

business leaders together to support our effort to create 300,000 green jobs by 2035 and 400,000 by 2050.

- Mandating that all new municipally owned buildings and major renovations be all-electric, effective immediately, and that every building in Los Angeles — from skyscrapers to single family homes — become emissions free by 2050.
- Achieving a zero waste future by phasing out styrofoam by 2021, ending the use of plastic straws and single-use takeout containers by 2028, and no longer sending any trash to landfills by 2050.
- Recycling 100% of our wastewater by 2035; sourcing 70% of our water locally — a significant increase from our existing pathway; and nearly tripling the maximum amount of stormwater captured.
- Planting and maintaining at least 90,000 trees — which will provide 61 million square feet of shade — citywide by 2021 and increasing tree canopy in low-income, severely heat impacted areas by at least 50% by 2028.

The Green New Deal's targets solidify L.A.'s position as the national leader in solar energy, electric vehicle infrastructure, and green jobs. It incorporates initiatives from 44 partner organizations, employing a unique, collaborative, multi-sector approach to meeting our shared goals of a more sustainable, equitable city. Our plan also calls for a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2025 — outpacing the standards set by the United Nations IPCC report.

Taken together, by 2050, the work and milestones of our Green New Deal are expected to save more than 1,600 lives, 660 trips to the hospital, and \$16 billion in avoided healthcare expenses each year.

Four years ago, Mayor Garcetti released Los Angeles' Sustainable City pLAN — his vision for a more sustainable, prosperous, and just Los Angeles, built on three Es: the environment, the economy, and equity.

The City has already met or exceeded 90% of the pLAN's near-term goals on time or early, and Angelenos have seen the results: L.A. became the number-one solar city in America, pioneered new transportation

technologies, reduced the city's greenhouse gas emissions by 11% in a single year, and created more than 35,000 green jobs.

Here's a glimpse at some of the other measures and accomplishments that have set Los Angeles on a path to carbon-neutrality by 2050:

- Developed comprehensive solar incentive programs for residents and businesses, which helped make Los Angeles the [#1 Solar City in America](#).
- Named the [#1 ENERGY STAR City](#) by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for having the most energy-efficient buildings in the U.S.
- Launched an unprecedented feasibility analysis with LADWP to study an equitable transition from fossil fuels to 100% renewable energy.
- Signed the [Fossil Fuel Free Streets Declaration](#) alongside 11 other C40 Mayors — which pledges to procure only zero-emission buses by 2025 and ensures that a major area of Los Angeles will be emissions-free by 2030.
- Installed 2,100 publicly available electric vehicle charging stations — the most of any U.S. city — with a plan for another 10,000 by 2022.
- Created a national platform for municipal fleet procurement — the Climate Mayors EV Purchasing Collaborative — after 30 Climate Mayors cities demonstrated the potential demand for over 114,000 electric vehicles of all types, including trash trucks, street sweepers, semis, shuttles, and buses — representing \$10 billion in investment.

For more information, or to download a copy of L.A.'s Green New Deal, visit: plan.lamayor.org

Support for L.A.'s Green New Deal from Key Community Partners

Andres Ramirez, L.A. Clean Energy Coalition: "The Los Angeles Clean Energy Coalition applauds Mayor Garcetti for establishing the Green New Deal in our city. This is a great day for Los Angeles! LACEC commits to helping the city reach its goal of 100% renewable energy by 2045. We also applaud the plan's vision to champion equity and establish

a goal to improve the Cal Enviro Screen scores of frontline communities in L.A.”

Mike Brune, Executive Director, Sierra Club: “Mayor Garcetti’s Green New Deal for Los Angeles is an example of the strong leadership and bold action we need in communities across the country to transition beyond dirty fuels and prevent the worst of the climate crisis. Los Angeles is stepping up to inspire the nation in how a city can transition to a clean energy economy that is rooted in equity to ensure everyone can access clean, affordable energy and new career opportunities.”

Mark Watts, Executive Director, C40 Cities: “Los Angeles’ pLAN sets a framework for what a green new deal means in action. The emissions reductions it targets are consistent with delivering on the ambition of the Paris Climate Agreement and keeping global temperature rise to within levels that scientists say are manageable. Thanks to Mayor Garcetti’s vision, all Angelenos will enjoy a healthier, more prosperous and sustainable future. Cities around the world are watching closely and taking inspiration from Los Angeles, because this is the thriving, low-carbon future we need being created before our eyes.”

Mary Leslie, President of the Los Angeles Business Council: “We applaud Mayor Garcetti for his leadership on sustainability and taking bold action to accelerate the city’s goal, attracting new investment and doubling the clean energy jobs over the next 15 years. Now is the time to make strong investments in our clean energy future. We look forward to achieving these goals in partnerships with business and community leaders.”

Veronica Padilla-Campos, Executive Director of Pacoima Beautiful: “We appreciate the leadership of Mayor Garcetti in establishing our city’s plan in the fight against climate change. L.A.’s Green New Deal sets the important precedent of prioritizing environmental justice communities. We applaud the establishment of the Climate Emergency Commission to include communities such as Pacoima in the implementation of the plan. We look forward to working with the Mayor in making sure our city’s Green New Deal is rooted in equity and benefits communities most in need.”

Bahram Fazeli, Policy Director at Communities for a Better Environment: “We really appreciate that Mayor Garcetti has made it clear in L.A.’s Green New Deal that a just transition away from fossil fuels and towards creating a strong clean energy economy must start with protecting front-line communities.”

Michael Kadish Executive Director of GRID Alternatives Greater Los Angeles: “Mayor Garcetti understands that facing the challenge of climate change is not only a responsibility, but an opportunity. We will continue to work with him to make sure that the jobs and benefits created by the Green New Deal are available to everyone in Los Angeles.”

[Read full story here...](#)