



Home

News

Sports

Opinion

Business

Entertainment

Lifestyles

Columnists

Jobs

Homes

Cars

Classified

Weekly Ads

Today's Paper

Times Record News

LOGIN | ACTIVATE ACCOUNT | TODAY'S PAPER

WICHITA FALLS

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

WANT FULL ACCESS?



Subscribe

OPINION BUSINESS ENTERTAINMENT LIFESTYLES

S HOMES CARS CLASSIFIED WEEKLY ADS



OPINION

# A's Clean Power Plan not so clean

The United States and China recently ratified the Paris Agreement on climate change, with the Obama administration's contribution being the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed Clean Power Plan — the largest climate-change regulation ever attempted in the U.S. — whose legality is currently being argued before the U.S. Supreme Court in Washington, D.C.

Recently, the public seems to know little about the Clean Power Plan, which I brought home to me recently when I spoke about energy to 200 people employed by one of the largest accounting firms. When I asked them how many had heard of the Clean Power Plan, only about 10 percent raised their hands.

The plan is being promoted as a means to accelerate a shift away from fossil-fuel-generating electricity fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas toward clean-generating sources such as wind and solar.

The plan's website clearly states the overarching goal: "Nationwide, by 2035, the Clean Power Plan will help cut carbon emissions from the power sector by 32 percent from 2005 levels, while starting to make progress

toward meaningful reductions in 2020."

Regardless of your perspective on climate and carbon, or on the legalities of the plan, it is valuable to examine some basic facts: The year 2005, the base year of the Clean Power Plan, is essentially tied with 2007 for the highest year of CO<sub>2</sub> power-sector emissions in the U.S. at about 2,400 million metric tons. The 2030 emissions goal is a 30 percent reduction from 2005, or roughly 1,680 million metric tons.

In 2015, U.S. power sector emissions were 1,900 million metric tons, already a 20 percent reduction from 2005. In fact, from 2005 to 2015, the U.S. reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions more than any other major economy in the world.

In other words, by 2015, we had already reduced emissions by 20 percent without a Clean Power Plan or government carbon price signal. Not only does the 30 percent goal in the plan not seem very ambitious, it appears misleading to trumpet a 30 percent target when 20 percent has already been achieved.

The 20 percent reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2005 to 2015 happened in three ways: renewable energy such as hydroelectric, wind and solar increased; there was a recession, which dampened energy demand; and the use of natural gas nearly doubled, which had the biggest impact.

Natural gas grew quickly because hydraulic fracturing (fracking) of shales created new supplies, causing natural-gas prices to plummet. If the pace of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction from 2005 to 2015 continues to 2030, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would be around 1,300 million metric tons — a 45 percent reduction from 2005 and substantially lower than the goals of the Clean Power Plan.

Confused? So am I. Why push for a Clean Power Plan if we are already two-thirds of the way there and headed — without federal intervention — lower than the ultimate goal of the plan?

As with most things in energy, there are politics involved. Take the proposed EPA rate-based CO<sub>2</sub> reduction burdens recommended by the

Clean Power Plan for each state. If you arrange the states from left to right on a graph, you'll see that the half on the left with the least proposed CO2 reduction burden voted 75 percent Democrat in the 2012 presidential race, and the half on the right with the greatest burden voted 66 percent Republican.

We should not judge political motivation or intention, but we do need to look at actual outcomes. Government carbon interventions have not worked very well in other countries, and in fact they have often had the opposite effect on actual CO2 emissions. In contrast, the U.S. has made great progress thus far, even if not orchestrated, without federal policy or agency rules.

Back in the early 2000s, the Kyoto Protocol — a precursor to the Paris Agreement — set out a similar goal, but in fact had the reverse impact: CO2 emissions in developed nations remained essentially flat, but emissions in developing nations increased sharply.

Nonetheless, some still argue the Clean Power Plan is needed, perhaps on philosophical or moral grounds. But if the goal is actual reductions in CO2 emissions, the road to green is not always a federal highway.

Scott W. Tinker is the state geologist of Texas, the director of the Bureau of Economic Geology and the Allday Endowed Chair in the Jackson School of Geosciences at The University of Texas at Austin.

0

Share

Tweet

Email

Print

## MORE OPINION

Bay: Congo's president risks civil war

Editorial: Obamacare a lightning rod in several places

Golderg: Double standarad on protocol

McGinnis: Remember Golden Rule when you vote

Basu: We know we need to choose correctly

NOW TRENDING

Were 12 disciples original dirty dozen?

Amfuel closing Arkansas plant, moving all production to Wichita Falls

Churches open pantry doors for Thanksgiving

Happy 85th Birthday Bob Seabury

Connect With Us Facebook Twitter YouTube

Useful Links e-Edition Classifieds Legal Notices Real Estate Automotive Crossword Puzzle Crime

About Us Contact Us Job Openings

Empty sidebar area

Letters to the Editor  
Matter of Record

Mobile Apps

iPhone

iPad

Android