

Ignoring climate risk is just bad planning

I love the article “Trump to reverse Obama-era order aimed at planning for climate change” (The Sentinel, Aug. 16) because it included a statement from the R Street Institute explaining how foolish Trump’s reversal is:

“Taxpayers have been made to shell out hundreds of billions of dollars in disaster-related spending over the past decade, including more than \$136 billion for just the two years from 2011 to 2013 ... evidence shows that every \$1 spent on disaster mitigation can save \$4 in post-disaster recovery and rebuilding costs.”

However, I wish the article had explained the origins of R Street, so readers would appreciate the seriousness of R Street’s opposition to Trump on this issue.

In 2012, the Heartland Institute’s public rejections of climate science became especially offensive. A group of Heartland employees who specialize in insurance industry issues could no longer tolerate Heartland’s rejection of climate science. These employees left Heartland and founded the conservative/libertarian R Street Institute.

It’s important to note that insurance companies and insurance analysts see climate change impacting claims. They see disaster claims from extreme weather events accelerating rapidly, and being in line with climate model predictions. Free-market conservatives don’t ignore risk. It’s sad that Trump wants us to ignore risk. How can that possibly be a reasonable, prudent approach?

Readers should please urge your governor to work with other New England governors who want to plan for stricter RGGI emissions caps for coming years. It’s prudent.

For more information, please contact Citizens’ Climate Lobby.

JUDY WEISS

1272 Beacon St., Apt. 8
Brookline, Mass.

[LINK](#)