

**From:** J. Brook <[jcbrook@vtelwireless.com](mailto:jcbrook@vtelwireless.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 9, 2024 8:37 AM

**To:** PUC - Clerk <[PUC.Clerk@vermont.gov](mailto:PUC.Clerk@vermont.gov)>

**Cc:** Mike Mrowicki <[mmrowicki@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:mmrowicki@leg.state.vt.us)>; wharrison <[wharrison@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:wharrison@leg.state.vt.us)>;  
[nhashim@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:nhashim@leg.state.vt.us)

**Subject:** Re: CLEAN HEAT STANDARD COMMENT - Pielke: Attribution alchemy serves legal and political ends...

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Montpelier legislators and bureaucrats would do well to step back from the fraudulent climate narrative. J. Brook, Putney

---

<https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/weather-attribution-alchemy>

In the aftermath of many high profile extreme weather events we see headlines like the following:

Climate change made US and Mexico heatwave 35 times more likely — BBC

Study Finds Climate Change Doubled Likelihood of Recent European Floods — NYT

Severe Amazon Drought was Made 30 Times More Likely by Climate Change — Bloomberg

**For those who closely follow climate science and the assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), such headlines can be difficult to make sense of because neither the IPCC nor the underlying scientific literature comes anywhere close to making such strong and certain claims of attribution.**

How then might we understand such high profile claims?

I'll try to answer this question in this new THB series — Weather Attribution Alchemy. Extreme weather event attribution has long been among the topics most requested by THB readers. In this first post in the series, I introduce some key concepts that will be important as the series evolves over the coming weeks and months. I'm counting on your engagement throughout the series.

Weather event attribution does not appear in the IPCC Glossary, however it does appear in the body of the AR6 report, where the IPCC explains that event attribution research seeks to “to attribute aspects of specific extreme weather and climate events to certain causes.”

**The IPCC continues:**

**“Scientists cannot answer directly whether a particular event was caused by climate change,<sup>1</sup> as extremes do occur naturally, and any specific weather and climate event is the result of a complex mix of human and natural factors.** Instead, scientists quantify the relative importance of human and natural influences on the magnitude and/or probability of specific extreme weather events.”

In future installments we will get into the gory details — the strengths and weaknesses — of the various approaches to event attribution studies. With this post I want to introduce three starting points for our discussions which will unfold over a series of posts in coming weeks and months.

**First, event attribution research is a form of tactical science — research performed explicitly to serve legal and political ends. This is not my opinion, but has been openly stated on many occasions by the researchers who developed and perform event attribution research.<sup>2</sup>** Such research is not always subjected to peer review, and this is often by design as peer-review takes much longer than the news cycle. Instead, event attribution studies are generally promoted via press release. ...

Weather event attribution methodologies have been developed not just to feed media narratives or support general climate advocacy. **Otto and others have been very forthright that the main function of such studies is to create a defensible scientific basis in support of lawsuits against fossil fuel companies** — She explains the strategy in detail in this interview, *From Extreme Event Attribution to Climate Litigation*. ...

---