

Appendix Four

From: Judy Ryan <judyryan46@icloud.com>

Subject: Re: 2nd Formal Complaint against the Department for Climate Change [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Date: 11 January 2014 3:54:20 pm AEDT

To: "Higgins, John" <John.Higgins@climatechange.gov.au>

Cc: Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au, Tony Abbott <Tony.Abbott.MP@aph.gov.au>

Dear Mr Higgins,

Your Response is still totally unsatisfactory.

Our complaints against your department are very specific.

(1) It has been the policy of the Department for the Environment (DOE) to colour the emissions of carbon-dioxide from coal fired power stations black in your publications, when it is clearly a transparent gas (*)

* *Dictionary of Environment and Development: People, Places, Ideas and Organizations*. By Andy Crump. MIT Press, 1993. Page 42: [CO₂] is a "colourless, odourless, non-toxic, non-combustible gas."

(2) DOE has published reports that refer to carbon-dioxide as "carbon pollution" and "carbon emissions" without distinguishing it from highly toxic forms of carbon such as carbon monoxide. Also, by colouring carbon-dioxide black DOE have misled Australian citizens to think of it as black carbon. This is extremely misleading as "black carbon" is soot as referred to in the IPCC 5th Assessment WG1 Draft 7 chapter 8. It is. As you can see from (**) soot is recognised as residue from the combustion process and is regionally specific. In Australia and most other nations, coal fired power stations have scrubbers that remove the soot. It is carbon-dioxide, not soot that is emitted into the atmosphere.

** Frieler et al. (2012) derived joint probability distributions for regionally averaged temperature and precipitation changes as linear functions of global average temperature and additional predictors including regionally specific SO_x and black carbon emissions. Final Draft (7 June 2013) Chapter 12 IPCC WGI Fifth Assessment Report

In our earlier correspondence you suggest that human activity will cause atmospheric CO₂ levels to increase to levels that will threaten the flora and fauna of our planet. This is absolutely incorrect on two counts *** and ****

***Carbon dioxide is "vital to life" and nontoxic to humans up till 50 times the concentration found in Earth's atmosphere. Natural emissions of CO₂ outweigh man-made emissions by a factor of twenty to one. <http://www.justfacts.com/globalwarming.basics.asp#>

**** levels of anthropogenic CO₂ are calculated at not more than 5% of the atmospheric CO₂ content. It has not increased at a statistically significant level in the last 150 years. To quote

from Wolfgang Knorr **Is the airborne fraction of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions increasing?** *Geophysical Research Letters*, November 7, 2009.

"It is shown that with those uncertainties, the trend in the airborne fraction since 1850 has been $0.7 \pm 1.4\%$ per decade, **i.e. close to and not significantly different from zero**"

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2009GL040613/abstract>

I am surprised that you refer me to the url *IPCC Fifth Assessment Report – Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. It is an unapproved draft and has the warning **Do Not Cite, Quote or Distribute** on its pages. This indicates to me that in Working Group I the scientists have not reached agreement on the basic science of 'Climate Change'.

Also you are incorrect when you state that the scientific issues raised in my email of 23 December are well known to the scientific community and are comprehensively addressed in these reports. Please point out, for example, where the *IPCC Fifth Assessment Report – Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis* (1) states that carbon-dioxide is not transparent, and (2) states that carbon-dioxide in either its gaseous or solid state, dry ice, is a pollutant.

In closing, the 28 day timeframe for DOE to respond satisfactorily has expired. We will be taking our formal complaint to the Ombudsman.

Regards

Dr Judy Ryan & Dr Marjorie Curtis