

Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) request

Received: 9 January 2025
Date: 4 February 2025
Ref: Sent by email from enquiries@theccc.org.uk
Published: www.theccc.org.uk/about/transparency

Your request:

Dear Emma

Correct me if I am wrong but carpeting the UK with wind solar and battery farms is no longer about saving the planet but generating "clean" energy? There is not anything clean about digging up half of the planet - more than 500,000 pounds of ore per battery - and gouging 200 times more finite commodities out of the environment supposedly at risk from Co2 to muster the belief that wind solar and batteries are "clean" methods of generating electricity. Carbon capture and storage will never work because of the parasitic load which consumes 30% of the energy generated by a coal or gas fired generator. We have gone from CAGW to Code Red and now Net Zero but neither the CCC or HMG have ever provided any evidence to support the relevance of any of these jargonised propagandist idiocies. We had a perfectly simple means of generating electricity until successive leftist communist and Marxist anti science witless politicians decided to gain popularity by misrepresenting science for populist admiration to win votes from a minority of activist freaks whose mentally deficiency has encouraged them to believe Co2 is the primary cause of climate change to blame humanity for causing the climate to change but change from what? There has never been a goldilocks climate but the closest to that indulgence was when dinosaurs ruled the world with atmospheric Co2 at 2,000ppmv down from 8,000ppmv during the Holocene optimum. We remain in a late Cenozoic ice age an interglacial where the average temperature is 14.98C down from 37C 485 million years ago.

<https://youtube.com/watch?v=KjPHuEOimYk&feature=shared>

It is about time you the CCC and HMG and idiot Miliband decided to provide evidence beyond reasonable doubt that squandering £60 billion a year of taxpayer's money which from hard evidence the majority cannot afford will provide a benefit for the UK in terms of temperature climate and weather. If you and Miliband cannot provide such evidence, then this miserably deficient Net Zero band wagon has to stop right now. If half of the planet's cars were replaced by EVs it would cut oil consumption by 10% easily eroded by all of the military fuel being consumed in Ukraine. But half of the planet's cars will never be replaced by EVs because the planet could never

generate sufficient electricity to charge the blessedly stupid dysfunctional crap that is an EV. If all American cars were switched to EVs America would need to double or triple the size of the grid and the same applies to the UK. The planet could not generate that volume of electricity its boneheaded stupid but apart from that there is not enough raw finite commodities to enable this manifestly idiotic fantasy. Co2 demonization is borne out of activism not science logic or reality and in reality, there is more risk of the solution to a problem which does not exist destroying the planet than any risk whatsoever of a few degrees of warmth as we either move out of the current ice age or revert to another full ice age.

Use rechargeable batteries? This means that accessing about 90,000 pounds of ore requires digging and moving between 200,000 and over 1,500,000 pounds of earth—a rough average of more than 500,000 pounds of ore per battery. Of course, this is not about saving the planet it's about victimisation of the essential gas of life Co2 in order to exercise totalitarian control over humanity which George Orwell warned us about. "I suspect that eradicating smallpox was wrong. It played a part in balancing ecosystems." John Davis, editor of Earth First! Journal. "The extinction of Homo Sapiens would mean survival of millions, if not billions, of Earth dwelling species. Phasing out of the human race will solve every problem on Earth – social and environmental." Ingrid Newkirk, former President of PETA.

FOI Request:

- As the UK emits 0.73% of global Co2 emissions and electricity generation represents 10% of 0.73% how much weather or extreme weather will be abated by electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How many millions of tons of concrete will be consumed by the process of electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How much sand and gravel will need to be extracted in order to enable electricity generation being Net Zero?
- As our capacity to manufacture high strength steel has been eliminated, how much steel will need to be imported from across the globe to enable the UK electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How much Co2 will be emitted in the process of UK electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How many acres of land will be consumed and destroyed by the process of the UK electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How many pylons will be erected in the process of the UK electricity generation being Net Zero?
- How much finite copper will be consumed in the process of Uk electricity generation becoming Net Zero?
- How much Co2 will be emitted in the process of copper ore being extracted refine and shipped across the oceans to enable the UK electricity generation to become Net Zero?

- As an off shore wind turbine can require as many as 1,000 piles all back filled with thousands of tons of concrete how much Co2 will be emitted in this process?
- What will be the add on costs of keeping 49 CCGT maintained and operational to generate electricity only when the sun doesn't shine and the wind doesn't blow?
- Germany has spent close to Euros 1 trillion on wind and solar resulting in VW closing three factories, Opel sacking 1600, Audi closing one factory due to high costs of chasing Net Zero what is the add on cost of reclaiming land destroyed?
- Germany has thousands of wind turbines kaput with blades disconnected flailing in the wind to make believe they are still working sitting on 41 million tons of concrete with no budget for restoration, who will pay for restoration in the UK?
- How much subsidy will UK consumer have to pay to support the subsidy driven wind farm speculators to make huge profit whether the wind blows or not?
- As 7,000 acres of land covered with solar panels upto 4 metres high might generate 50MWs some of the time with panels made in China which burns 4.6 billion tons of coal each year how does 10% of 0.73% influence UK weather?
- As the world in general burned 8.6 billion tons of coal in 2023 with there rise exceeding our total emissions how will 10% of 0.73% influence the UK temperature climate and weather?
- As the world thus far has squandered \$10 trillion on Co2 mitigation with the annual rise of 3ppmv in the atmospheric concentration of Co2 unabated how will £40 billion squandered on wind and solar for the UK influence our weather?
- As we remain in the late Cenozoic Ice Age - interglacial - coldest now for 485 million years with the average temperature down from 37C to 14.98C what is the risk of abating Co2 generating another ice age?
- As we remain in a cost of living crisis with growth stumbling to a halt because Reeves budget what would anyone in their right mind advocate increasing the cost of energy when UK energy is already the highest in the developed world?
- As the industrial part of the UK economy has declined further from 15% to 8.5% due to successive governments obsession with decarbonisation not reducing our emissions in fact increasing because instead of making stuff in the UK we import it from China, how does that influence climate change?
- China has 1142 operating coal fired power stations with 300 under construction, India has 850 coal stations with 27Gws under construction, with 1,000 new coal plants under construction across the planet what is the point of crippling the UK economy further by further increasing the cost of energy to the point of self destruction?

- For every petrol and diesel car on the planet to be replaced by an EV the planet would need to mine 544 years of lithium, how will this level of manic destruction protect the environment supposedly at risk from Co2?
- CCS has failed across the planet simply because it wastes at least 30% of the power generated to capture sequester compress transit and store under pressure for all time, methane is finite hence no interest, doesn't anyone at energy security understand numbers?

IPCC have said repeatedly that weather now in incidence or extreme within recorded history is no worse. China and the rest of the world have more interest in the UK shutting down its industry in the perverse pursuit of polishing halos and virtual signalling at the cost of people who can never benefit from the Net Zero process and to imply otherwise is a lie. Mining for Net Zero commodities demands an increase of 7,000%. A 1.3GW CCGT consumes 43 acres of land, Hinkley C 430 acres, wind turbines and solar panels hundreds of thousands of acres. For £40 billion we could have 40GWs of CCGT or supercritical coal fired capacity with 300 years of coal under our feet, America has 1,000 years of coal.

- Ironic contradiction. Saving the planet. Consequences of leftist woke idiocy. Every Tesla battery consumes 50 barrels of oil for mining and manufacture gasoline cars diddly squat. For just one lithium supply mine where entire mountains are eliminated. Each mine usually consists of thirty-five to forty humongous 797 Caterpillar haul trucks along with hundreds of other large equipment. Each 797 uses around half a million gallons of diesel a year. So, with an inventory of just thirty-five the haul trucks alone are using 17.5 million gallons of fuel a year for just one lithium site.

- When prices are set they are set at the highest price in the auction not the lowest price which will be the price of battery input not coal or gas. The reason why solar speculators will put batteries on a solar project, its about profit not saving the planet because the planet is not at risk only the environment at both ends of the spectrum first destroyed by mining then destroyed again by turning our green and pleasant land into a factory complex destroying bio diversity which I thought is what activist like to say is at risk from Co2 without which there would be no environment.

- Change what we eat. Cut meat consumption by 40%. Data tells the truth and numbers do not lie. Total methane emissions from all sources including wetlands and fossil fuels are about 614,000,000 tons/year. Residual atmospheric methane is 0.00019%. 1.4 billion cows emit 86 million tons of methane annually which is 14% of total emissions. Therefore 14% of – residual CH4 - 0.00019% is 0.0000238% that is 2.38 trillionths of atmospheric CH4. Atmospheric methane needs to be at least 100 times more prolific to have even the slightest influence on climate. Insofar as UK cows are concerned which are 0.69% of the global total at 0.0000000229908% of 0.00019%.

- Stop methane emissions. Total methane emissions from all sources including wetlands and fossil fuels are about 614,000,000 tons/year. Residual atmospheric methane is 0.00019%. 1.4 billion cows emit 86 million tons of methane annually which is 14% of total emissions. Therefore 14% of – residual CH4 - 0.00010% is 0.0000238% that is 2.38 trillionths of atmospheric CH4. Atmospheric methane needs to be at least 100 times more prolific to have even the slightest influence on climate. Insofar as UK cows are concerned which are 0.69% of the global total at 0.0000000229908% of 0.00019%. Methane The Irrelevant GHG. Methane The Irrelevant GHG. (CH4) has narrow absorption bands at 3.3 microns and 7.5 microns (the red lines). CH4 is 20 times more effective an absorber than CO2 – in those bands. However, CH4 is only 0.00018% (1.8 parts per billion) of the

atmosphere. Moreover, both of its bands occur at wavelengths where H₂O is already absorbing substantially. Hence, any radiation that CH₄ might absorb has already been absorbed by H₂O. The ratio of the percentages of water to methane is such that the effects of CH₄ are completely masked by H₂O. The amount of CH₄ must increase 100-fold to make it comparable to H₂O. Because of that, methane is irrelevant as a greenhouse gas. The high per-molecule absorption cross section of CH₄ makes no difference at all in our real atmosphere. It cannot contribute to atmospheric warming or climate change.

- For the planet to be Net Zero by 2050 it would need to build 3 Hinkley C nuclear power stations every day for 11,051 days that is 33,153 Hinkley Cs. Normally it takes 10 years to gain approval from all of the regulatory bodies involved so that is never going to happen in the UK EU or America but also unlikely in China because nuclear power plants take time to construct. So let's look at wind turbines. The planet would need to install 1500 wind turbines – covering 300 square miles – every day for 11,051 days or 17 million x 4 at 25% efficiency which is 68 million wind turbines. Mao's fantastical facile credulous ideology killed 60 million. For the UK:
- Hinkley 2 x 1.6GW's, 100GW's at £11.25 billion x 1.6GW's is £703 billion, that is 62.5 new nuclear generators by 2050, dream on!! That is one Hinkley C/year for 30 years, another wet green dream.
- 240,000 150MWh battery back up sets cost £9 trillion.
- 50GW's of wind at 2.5MW X's 20,000 at £3,000,000 is £60,000,000,000 plus x 4 because turbines at best are 24% efficient. Therefore £240 billion. That is 55 turbines/month for 30 years. Replaced every 15/20 years into infinity.
- An army of peaker plants coal or gas to provide hot spinning backup to keep the lights on at £1 billion/GW X's 90% of non dispatchable supply, because nuclear wind and solar cannot be ramped to meet demand.
- £45 billion for 45GW's of CCGT or coal fired capacity. That is 1.5GW's of coal or CCGT every year for 30 years.
- Rewiring the UK for all electric £1 trillion. Duncan Smith will have to dig up every road and path in the UK to triple the size of cabling to cope with 2 electric boilers to replace one gas boiler, power to run a heat pump 24/7 and charge and electric EV.
- Total cost of retrofitting ground source heat pumps and bespoke insulation to 26 million homes £3.9 trillion. BBC Panorama 3 bed semi £30,000 for heat pump system + £80k for bespoke insulation craned over house.
- 34 million EV's at £45k each £1.8 trillion.
- Net Zero give or take £6 trillion. For the planet £708 trillion. Total world debt \$140 trillion. American debt \$24 trillion. Atmospheric Co₂ 0.04% or 414ppmv. Cambrian 8,000ppmv or when dinosaurs ruled the planet 2,500ppmv.
- £1 trillion more like £20 trillion.

- Renewable energy. \$10 trillion squandered to generate by wind 2.8% of electricity demand. To make one Tesla battery: (Same applies to 150MWh back up battery sets, no difference) Net Zero would demand 544 years of lithium production, which doesn't even exist, hence 15 minute cities and permanent lockdown, belief in activist trash is merely a sprat to catch a draconian tyrannical mackerel, the complete shut down of civilisation, inhumane and totally unnecessary. Bill Gates/Claus Schwab WEF bone headed trash. They still believe they can use their private jets whilst we get dried fly shit for food. In total then, acquiring just these five elements to produce the 1,000-pound EV battery requires mining the global total at 0.0000000229908% of 0.00019%. Methane The Irrelevant GHG. Methane The Irrelevant GHG. (CH₄) has narrow absorption bands at 3.3 microns and 7.5 microns (the red lines). CH₄ is 20 times more effective an absorber than CO₂ – in those bands. However, CH₄ is only 0.00018% (1.8 parts per billion) of the atmosphere. Moreover, both of its bands occur at wavelengths where H₂O is already absorbing substantially. Hence, any radiation that CH₄ might absorb has already been absorbed by H₂O. The ratio of the percentages of water to methane is such that the effects of CH₄ are completely masked by H₂O. The amount of CH₄ must increase 100-fold to make it comparable to H₂O. Because of that, methane is irrelevant as a greenhouse gas. The high per-molecule absorption cross section of CH₄ makes no difference at all in our real atmosphere. It cannot contribute to atmospheric warming or climate change.

Impossible dream.

[name redacted]

Our response:

Thank you for your request. We have handled your request under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

We are refusing your request under regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR, as the request for information is manifestly unreasonable.

We have applied a public interest test to this exemption. There is always some public interest in disclosure of information. However, given the nature of your questions, it is unlikely that we hold any information that would not already be available from public sources. A substantial amount of information on the science of climate change and the effectiveness (including costs and use of materials) of climate change mitigation is already in the public domain. The public interest in disclosure is therefore limited.

The public interest in refusing your request lies in the offensive nature of the request and the substantial diversion of resources from our statutory purposes that would be involved in responding to it. We have concluded that the public interest lies in refusing your request.

We are unable to confirm whether or not we hold the information requested, as the costs of checking this would substantially exceed the threshold of reasonable cost (see below for estimate of cost):

Your request contains 23 questions.

We would need to ask each of our analytical staff (40) to search for information on these questions.

Assuming a search time of 5 minutes per question (given the nature of these questions, we would need to run multiple search terms to identify information):

23 x 40 x 5 minutes = 4,600 minutes or 76 hours.

Information disclosed in response to this EIR request is releasable to the public. In keeping with the spirit and effect of the EIR and the government's Transparency Agenda, this letter and the information disclosed to you may be placed on the CCC website, together with any related information that will provide a key to its wider context. No information identifying you will be placed on the CCC website.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review. If you are not content with the outcome of the review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. In keeping with our transparency policy, the information released to you will be published on www.theccc.org.uk. Please note that this publication will not include your personal data.

Kind regards,

Climate Change Committee