

'Climate change' – a threat to America's landmarks?

Chris Woodward

May 22, 2014

People on both sides of the "climate change" debate continue to weigh in on this week's warning that historic and cultural landmarks are at risk.

The Union of Concerned Scientists says climate change-caused heavy rains, increased flooding and wildfires, among other things, are putting various sites around the U.S. at risk. In its report "National Landmarks at Risk," UCS lists 30 at-risk locations – among them the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island; Jamestown, Virginia; the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse in North Carolina; and the Kennedy Space Center.

<u>Katharine Hayhoe</u>is an atmospheric scientist and contributor to many climate change reports. While neither a member of UCS nor a contributor to the UCS report, she says it does show how something Americans care about could be affected by climate change.

"... [I]n this case, many of our national monuments could potentially be at risk ...," she says. "And again, that's providing us with another reason for why we might be concerned about climate change, if our national landmarks are something that matter to us."

Marc Morano, spokesman for the climate change-skeptic organization <u>Climate Depot</u>, dismisses the report.

"First of all, the Union of Concerned Scientists is an environmental activist organization. So this is just designed to be max-alarming and silly," he argues. "Ultimately, this is a model-based study of what could/might/may happen – and it completely confuses any negative outcome with being human-caused."

Chip Knappenberger, assistant director at the Cato Institute's Center for the Study of Science, said as much in <u>a related article</u> from *USA Today*.

Regardless, the report from UCS isn't peer-reviewed. People who argue climate change is real, that it's happening and is going to get worse typically point to peer-reviewed information to make their argument. When asked about that, Hayhoe acknowledged the lack of peer-review, but says the climate information the authors used did come from peer-reviewed sources. Morano, meanwhile, said the report is "nonsense."