



nearly 20 years starting in 1975.”

Minnis also argued that a steady increase in cloud cover over the United States, about one per cent a decade, was due to increasing air travel. He also found that increases in cloud cover were more pronounced in populated areas, and stronger in winter, when contrails are bigger.

The warming effect happened because the high-altitude clouds that contrails created tended to trap warm air, Minnis wrote. On balance, though contrails can both warm and cool, there is more of a warming effect.

A Penn State study compared regions of the United States where contrails tended to form more strongly with areas where they didn't. The more contrail-heavy the area, the less the variation between daytime highs and nighttime lows tended to be.

In a 2005 paper, physicist Robert Noland of Imperial College London suggested that restricting airliners to 31,000 feet, and 24,000 feet in winter, could reduce the formation of contrails. Though lower-flying planes would be less fuel-efficient, Noland argued that the increased fuel consumption would be more than made up for by less contrail-linked clouds as a cause of global warming.

So not impressed with the current state of the "science" and unhappy that the Gov't is taking steps that have the potential to very seriously affect the country's GDP. Take natural gas as an example. Fonterra need it for their boilers, spray dryers and evaporators. Process gas is not easily substituted and so if the local supply dwindles, it will need to be imported in the form of LNG. The cost will be about 6 X or more but it will also have a severe impact on the production of GWP gases because LNG has about 50% of its original energy by the time it gets to the end user.

I don't expect another reply but like many others who are not sheeple, am desperately unhappy with the international politics and propaganda surrounding global warming science and the associated decisions.

Best

s 9(2)

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

----- Original Message -----

On Thursday, December 13, 2018 3:59 PM, Rachel Ward <[Rachel.Ward@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:Rachel.Ward@parliament.govt.nz)> wrote:

Kia ora s 9(2)(a)

On behalf of Hon James Shaw, many thanks for your email and for bringing this video to the Minister's attention.

The evidence of global warming is best summarised by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose Fifth Assessment Report was completed in November 2014 and is available at <http://ipcc.ch/report/ar5>. This report represents the global scientific consensus on climate change, which New Zealand accepts.

This Government takes climate change seriously, and has made responding to climate change a priority.

Kind regards

Rachel



**Rachel Ward** | Private Secretary, Climate Change

**Office of Hon James Shaw**

Minister for Climate Change | Minister of Statistics | Associate Minister of Finance | Acting Associate Minister of Transport | Acting Associate Minister of Health

Level 7, Bowen House, Parliament Buildings, 80 Lambton Quay | Private Bag 18041 | Wellington 6160 | New Zealand

E: [rachel.ward@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:rachel.ward@parliament.govt.nz)

Cell: 022 010 0167

*Note I work part-time in this office. My regular hours are Monday (full day), Tuesday (2 - 5pm), Wednesday (8am - 12pm), Thursday (12 - 5pm) and Friday (8am - 12pm). If you need to contact me urgently, please call the number above.*

**From:** S 9(2)(a)

**Sent:** Tuesday, 11 December 2018 10:47 PM

**To:** [james.shaw@greens.org.nz](mailto:james.shaw@greens.org.nz)

**Subject:** Climate Change

James,

I am NOT a knocker of AGW and fully support initiatives for reducing pollution of all types, waste minimisation, recycling, reduced or banned use of artificial fertilisers and pesticides/herbicides/preservatives and generally trying to make the world a healthier and more sustainable place. As a NZ voter however, I ask you to fully apprise yourself of this documentary <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYhCQv5tNsQ> There are numerous similar videos, however this one is credible in respect that real people with credentials are offering their views.

I do not profess to understand much about climatology but know enough about physics to agree with the evidence presenting by various commentators showing that the impact of humans on climate change amounts to between 1 and 4%. The other 96% to 99% is due to natural phenomena beyond our control. To lend credence to the 1 - 4% AGW impact range, shortly after WWII climatologists were extremely concerned about the earth entering into a mini ice-age. So temperatures were declining, in spite of the consumer age that was heating up at an unprecedented rate, resulting in rapidly increasing levels of atmospheric CO2. Interestingly at the time, increasing CO2 was being blamed for the cooling!!!

Applying some more physics, compare the Earth's average temperature relative to say Venus. Based on inverse square and Stefan-Boltzmann (radiating body) calculations, Venus is within 1 Kelvin of Earth's average temperature. The kicker is planet earth has ~0.1 % "global warming" CO2 in its atmosphere while Venus is reported as being >96% CO2. The \$Billion question is, why isn't Venus much, much warmer given its blanket of CO2 that is about 1,000 X that of Earth? My example is probably of no value for many reasons, but may possibly call to question, the GWP of CO2...?

I trust that the video will be of some interest but note that I much prefer to remain anonymous unless you wanted to have a face-to-face sometime. Maybe you want a sounding board who is a pragmatist that hates hidden agendas and politics but likes the whole truth to be presented?

Best regards

s 9(2)(a)

PS I am interested in your new NZGIF initiative and when the fund is up and running, intend making application for funds for a number of green projects.

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

---

---