

Replies received 2014:

More articles and letters received on various issues. In order to simplify, our comments are written in Times New Roman block while the letters are in Arial.



**The Climate
Reality Project**

<http://climaterealityproject.org/>

True change happens when we embrace reality.

Today, we know climate disruption is the biggest challenge humanity has ever faced. And we know carbon pollution is to blame.

But at Climate Reality, we also know that solutions are right in front of us. We can create a healthy, sustainable, and prosperous future by making a global shift from dirty fossil fuels to clean, renewable energies like solar and wind.

Our leaders aren't going to do it on their own. So we're bringing millions together to make them, demanding change with a collective voice so loud and forceful they have no choice but to help shape the clean-energy future we need.

The Climate Reality Project was something we came across recently on the Net and if 'reality's what they want then I'm sure we can find plenty of it. Let's take a look at a letter below as an example.

Our great concern when it comes to sandeels **other than industrial fishing is the impact of changing sea temperatures, driven by climate change,** which are affecting the plankton community, upon which sandeels feed (and in turn the seabirds). There is now growing evidence that sandeels are not only less abundant but also in some areas smaller and less nutritious, than they used to be, meaning seabirds have to spend more energy to get the same amount of food. The worrying declines of sandeel-dependent seabird species in Scotland is in large part related to this. Sandeel larvae are dependent on the right sort of plankton at the right time when they hatch in winter and it seems that the conditions for their survival, growth and recruitment may be getting worse. In 2008, the (UK) Sir Alister Hardy Foundation for Ocean Science (SAHFOS) recently reported a 70% reduction in the biomass of *Calanus* copepods (shrimp-like zooplankton) in the North Sea since the 1960s. To make matters worse, not only has the abundance changed but also the cold water zooplankton *Calanus finmarchicus* is progressively being replaced by a warmer-water species *Calanus helgolandicus* that blooms at a different time to and is less nutritious than its cold-water counterpart.

These changes, in turn, are almost certainly being driven by changes in the sea environment that we still know little about but are almost certainly related to the warming of the sea and subsequent changes in the plankton community. The surface temperature of the North Sea and the North-east Atlantic have both risen in the last 50 years. The 10 degree C isotherm has moved from the southern North Sea into the North Atlantic at a rate of 22km per year since the 1980s. Models project that temperatures will continue to rise in UK and northeastern Atlantic waters up until at least the 2080s when they could be 2-3 degrees warmer than now. However, in the next 10 years, natural oceanic and atmospheric variability make it difficult to predict whether temperatures will go up or down. Such temperature rises are hard to believe in the cold weather we've had last winter and spring but the long term trend is undoubtedly of major temperature rise and this is likely to have profound impacts on the food chain and seabirds like the Puffin.

This trend will be hard to reverse in the short to medium term but we have to continue to maintain vigilance on the sandeel fishery to make sure it doesn't aggravate the situation. The RSPB is also working to ensure that seabirds and the marine environment in general are as resilient as possible to the climate-induced pressures. One of the ways of providing this resilience is to have an effective network of marine protected areas, which includes key seabird foraging areas, as well as key sandeel spawning grounds. You can find out more about our work on this at www.rspb.org.uk/marine. Sandeels breed on the sandbanks round our coasts. As you imply, ones in the Irish Sea are doing OK for some reason, perhaps because they are a mix of 2 species which each has a different ecology (one is a summer breeder and may be more resilient to sea warming), and also there is apparently a greater diversity of prey for Irish Sea seabirds to exploit.

The adults of the cold water sandeel species which predominates in the North Sea emerge from the sand in late winter to lay their eggs which hatch into larvae. These need zooplankton to grow and thrive and, with sea warming, it is the loss of the cold water zooplankton species (*Calanus finmarchicus*) and its progressive replacement (particularly since the 1980s) with a warmer water species (*C. helgolandicus*) which is thought to be the issue. The 'new' plankton has a different seasonal cycle, is less nutritious and much less abundant than the cold water one it is replacing so there is probably a mismatch with the hatching of the sandeel larvae which is working to their disadvantage.

To emphasise the reduction in abundance, the biomass of zooplankton in the North Sea has declined by around 70% since the 1960s, a massive change recognised as a fundamental 'regime shift' by marine biologists. The Larvae apart, there is also evidence that the sandeels themselves are becoming smaller and less nutritious, which again points the finger at a deterioration in their planktonic diet. If they survive, the sandeel larvae and the juveniles which develop from them have a complicated drift pattern with the currents in the North Sea but when they finally settle on a sandbank, they are then sedentary there for the rest of their lives (which maybe be 5-8 years if they are not eaten by anything first - they also get eaten by other fish, like cod, whiting and mackerel, by seals, porpoises and other cetaceans). This is worth mentioning because many people talk of sandeels moving around but in fact they hardly do once they've settled on a sandbank.

Seabirds in the north of Scotland are faring worst. We do not fully understand the reasons for this but 2 factors may be relevant. First, if sandeels disappear, there are no sprats as alternative prey in Orkney and Shetland for seabirds to fall back on. Second, it appears (counter-intuitively) that sea temperatures when sandeels spawn are higher in the far north (presumably a Gulf Stream effect) than in the central-southern North Sea at the same time of year, so paradoxically the more northern latitudes may be more badly affected. This is borne out by massive and chronic breeding failure of puffins and other sandeel-dependent seabirds in recent years in Iceland (where there's never been a commercial sandeel fishery) and the Faroes, attributed to a slump in sandeel abundance. Oceanographers talk (in journal papers) of pulses of tropical water entering the Icelandic current system and undermining arctic sandeel larval production.

We believe that this climate change factor is much more significant than any conceivable negative impact of the Danish-led sandeel fishery which is now much more tightly managed than it was 10 or 15 years ago. In those days the average annual catch was around 600,000 tonnes but these days the fleet struggles to catch half that much, despite its best efforts. The amount of fishing effort allowed is carefully controlled and dictated by the strength of the incoming recruitment of sandeels each year to each of 7 areas in the North Sea, so they are managed separately as compartments. In addition, the big sandeel 'box' (over 20,000 sq kms) off the east coast of Scotland (set up in 2000 and still in place today) and NE England excludes the fleet from fishing close inshore where they might compete directly with seabird colonies. The Danish sandeel trawler fleet is also two-thirds smaller than what it was a decade or more ago. The best scientific opinion we have is that the sandeel fishery as currently managed is sustainable.

Lastly, scallop dredging does have the potential to damage the seabed but most of it is close inshore and we do not think it is causing widespread damage to the sandeel sandbanks that our key seabird colonies depend on.

Source A Case Against the RSPB, our own report

This letter, which was originally sent to ourselves from the RSBP., relating to starving seabird chicks all around the North Sea. You will notice in this how they will quickly get industrial fishing out of the way as being little more than a minor distraction, they are even more dismissive of the unregulated Danish Sandeel fleets that are still raping the seas around Dogger Bank and scallop dredging according to them hardly registers as any threat at all. Further more they fail spectacularly to take into account the tens of thousands of tons of dioxin Swedish paper mills are dumping into the Baltic each and every year. All of this going on and probably more besides and they're poncing about with all of these hypothetical possibilities. And this is the thinking these days, if they were to stub their toe on the garden path I am sure they would somehow put it down to global warming. It's odd though that Sandeel numbers are doing just fine in the relatively warmer seas over to the west of the UK., where the Gulf Stream influences the temperatures.

That said, there can be no doubt that ice-shelves are melting, and on a personal note I hate pollution probably more than most, but to be so blinkered into thinking industrial-fishing, dredging and pollutants couldn't possibly be effecting Sandeels and it must without question all be down to warming seas, is just beyond rational thinking. Willful misinformation bordering onto an insane obsession with which they are brainwashing entire nations. Rarely are rain-forests, which are now reduced to the size of a small walnut on the word-map, even considered at all of this. Were these forests to be reinstated to their rightful size, something that could so easily be done incidentally, they would store truly massive amounts of carbon (I refer readers back to the Plant Forests and Make a Fortune paper).

The answer instead is to build more and more wind-farms and should even more reality be required, please take a look at any of the links and picture below:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8NAAzBArYdw>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RcTjdY1aN4>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRSaVD8VAbI>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtgBWNKwBkE>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6x1hT5SONUg>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CEersoJLtRw>

<http://www.iberica2000.org/Es/Articulo.asp?Id=2968>

<http://www.epaw.org/multimedia.php?article=b2>

<http://www.epaw.org/multimedia.php?lang=es&article=b6> Bats being hit.

With bird numbers down, anything you are still seeing are those that haven't been killed yet!



An Eagle's Body Sliced in Half by a Turbine-Blade

From: Sally.Thomas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
To: cates.1980@aol.co.uk
Sent: Thu, 27 Feb 2014 15:45
Subject: Reply from the Scottish Government.

Your ref:
Our ref: 2014/0002949
24 February 2014

Mr Piller

Thank you for your letter to Scottish Ministers dated 22 January. The Minister for Environment and Climate Change, Mr Paul Wheelhouse has asked me to reply on his behalf. Your letter deals with a number of issues about which you clearly feel very strongly. You also cite examples where, in your opinion, **the RSPB have not acted in a way which you consider to be appropriate.**

I'm sure you will appreciate that I cannot comment on the conduct of any individual organisation such as the RSPB. If you have issues with the way they conduct their campaigning you will need to raise those with them direct. **If you feel that they are not acting in a way which accords with their status as a charity then that would be a matter which you could address to the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator.**

Yours sincerely

Sally Thomas, Land Use and Biodiversity Team Leader, Environment and Forestry Directorate, Natural Resources Division

This we thought was great advice and decided this was what we would do. Please read replies from the Scottish Charity Regulator below.

From: Thomas.Carson@oscr.org.uk
To: h.pagan.pla@aol.co.uk
Sent: Wed, 12 Mar 2014 15:43
Subject: Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, SC037654

Our Ref: MI/INQ/14-0718

Dear Sir,

I acknowledge receipt of your email with your letter attached, which was received on 28 February.

Please find attached a copy of our Inquiry and Intervention Policy which explains how we deal with the issues that are raised with us.

We will contact you again once we have considered the content of your letter.

Yours sincerely Thomas Carson

From: andrew.boler@oscr.org.uk
To: h.pagan.pla@aol.co.uk
Sent: Fri, 16 May 2014 11:55
Subject: RE: Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, SC037654

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your email dated 28th February 2014 relating to the RSPB. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding.

We have now had an opportunity to give full consideration to the matters you have raised against RSPB in accordance with our Inquiry and Intervention Policy, a copy of which was attached to our email acknowledgement issued to yourself on 12th March 2014. This email sets out and explains our position regarding the matters you have raised.

Assessment

As our Inquiry and Intervention Policy explains, we act in the public interest not on behalf of individuals or groups. The complaint you make, regarding various policies and decisions the RSPB have taken around the protection of birds, we would view as a concern you should take directly to the charity and dealt with through their complaints process. From your correspondence it appears you have taken your concerns to the charity, however we are not an appeals process or alternative avenue for you to take your complaint if you are not happy with the charity's response. Responsibility for the management of a charity rests with its charity trustees and we will not intervene where trustees have made decision about running their organisation within the law and provisions of the governing document. In assessing your complaint we have not identified any matters of a regulatory nature that require further action by us. We therefore do not consider it is proportionate or in the public interest for us to make further inquiries and we are closing our file.

We hope this information is helpful and that it explains our position.

Kind Regards Andrew Boler, Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) 2nd Floor, Quadrant House, 9 Riverside Drive, Dundee, DD1 4NY | www.oscr.org.uk |

Sign up to OSCR Reporter: Keep up to date with all the latest news, consultations and events with our free bi-monthly eNewsletter and email alerts.

And so, on that note all of the misdealings carried out by the RSPB. over the past forty years or so were very predictably ignored. The fact that we'd previously taken our concerns to the charity should've been neither here nor there. As far as 'public interest' is concerned, it entirely depends on which members of the public they'd be referring to. Anyone caring remotely for the natural world would've been let down greatly whilst those who care for nothing at all would of course had been unaffected. As for the birds themselves are concerned, something that seems to have been forgotten in all of this, I'll refer you back to the list, in the last report, of those birds we feel have been appallingly let down by the charity.

Real Life Bugs Magazine, see the link.

<http://www.reallifebugs.co.uk/>

A joint venture of National Geographic and Natural History Museum

Some people think they can exploit what the hell they like. Please drop them a line and tell them what you think.

reallifebugs@dbfactory.co.uk; rrhh@rba.es; bissett@bissettmags.com.au; feedback@natgeotv.com; mpotts@ngs.org; apps@ngs.org; ramberg@ngs.org; speakers@ngs.org; traveler@ngs.org; ngslines@customersvc.com; kids@ngs.org; ngsdigital@customersvc.com; webmaster@nationalgeographic.com; groupsales@ngs.org; ngtickets@ngs.org; info@planitgreenlive.com; support@animaljam.com; bworthin@ngs.org; genographic@ngs.org; custserv@natgeovideos.com askngs@nationalgeographic.com; natgeocreative@ngs.org; ngsintl@customersvc.com

.....
Finally, I'll now leave you with a Juice Media news clip.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_profilepage&v=ZeFJkGfaoxs

Concluding: We print any letters here from all sides of both arguments. So long as it's relevant to subject matters, and provided it's not obscene, we will print it. If you disagree with anything that's said, please write in. This is a public arena so please feel free to have your say.