



Global Climate Coalition

***A voice for business in
the global warming debate***

GCC STUDIES

**Climate
Economics**

**Climate
Science**

**Climate
Change
Primer**

**What
Others Are
Saying**

**Climate
Change in
the News**

**Climate
Watch Brief
Newsletter**

**Climate
Links**

**GCC News
Releases**

**GCC
Studies**

**GCC
Mission**

HOME

Global Climate Economic Impact Studies

The President's chief economic advisor, Dr. Janet Yellen, has provided very limited supporting information behind her claims of "modes economic impact" from the Kyoto Treaty. Their results rely heavily on the unrealistic assumptions of more than 75% of credits from emissions trading and world-wide developing country participation. Several economic impact studies have been commissioned to date. Following is a summary of many of the most recent studies.

Study: **Charles River Associates**

Date: **March 1999**

Click here, to download the new Charles River Associates study or send an email request for a copy to the Global Climate Coalition.

NOTE: This study is in 'pdf' format and requires Adobe Acrobat to download.

Study: **The Case for a Rational Approach to Climate Change
Economic Strategy Institute**

Date: **November 1998**

The executive summary for this study can be found at
www.econstrat.org/kyotoexecsumm.htm

A copy of the study can also be ordered from the site.

Contact: Sarah Lomas at (202) 289-1288

**Global
Climate
Coalition****1275 K St, NW
Washington,
DC 20005****202-682-9161****Media
Contact:
Frank
Maisano****202-628-3622****Study: Energy Information Administration****For: Department of Energy****Date: March 1998**

The EIA concluded the Kyoto Treaty would only slow modestly the growth of GHG emissions. CO2 emissions would grow 32% above 1990 levels by 2010 - slightly less than the 44% growth that would occur without the treaty - because of growth of emissions in developing countries like China, Mexico and India. By 2020, emissions would grow by nearly 60% even if the U.S., Europe, Japan and other industrialized nations comply with the Kyoto requirements.

Contact: Jay Hakes or Mary Hutzler at (202) 586-2222

Study: Argonne National Laboratory**For: Department of Energy****Date: February 1997**

The Argonne Study concluded that policy restrictions on six energy intensive industries in developed countries, but not their less developed trading partners, would result in significant adverse impact. Furthermore, the study finds emissions would not be reduced significantly. The main effect of the policy would be to redistribute output, employment and emissions from developed countries to developing countries who are not required to participate.

Contact: Harvey Drucker at (630) 252-3804 or Bill Wicker at (202) 586-5806

Study: WEFA, Inc.**For: Industry Groups****Date: April 1998**

WEFA estimates that a carbon fee of \$265 per metric ton would be required by late next decade to reduce emissions to the Kyoto Protocol's levels, resulting in (1) Total output reduction of 3.2% or \$300 billion (in 1992\$) or \$2700 per family; (2) Loss of more than 2.4 million jobs; (3) a competitive advantage for advanced developing countries that are not required to participate; and (4) Sharply higher gasoline (65 cents per gallon) and gas and electricity prices (double).

Contact: Mary Novak at (781) 221-0340

Study: CONSAD Research Corporation**Date: March 1998**

Based on reductions 3% below 1990 levels, CONSAD estimates that by the year 2010, more than 3.5 million jobs will be lost, mostly in the aluminum, chemicals, mining, paper, petroleum and steel industries. CONSAD estimates a loss of \$359 billion in Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Energy prices will rise by 59% causing a \$87 billion reduction in disposable income or \$875 per household.

Contact: Will Steger at (412) 363-5500

Study: Standard & Poor's DRI**For: Labor Unions****Date: August 1998**

This study prepared for labor unions, confirms that even with significant emissions trading and other flexibility mechanisms, the Kyoto Protocol will (1) cost 1.3 to 1.7 million jobs, (2) annual GDP losses of \$112 to \$178 billion, (3) cause energy prices to rise up to 77% in some sectors, (4) cause household income to decrease 1,021 to 1,403 per family and (5) increase household energy costs by 1,012 to 1,574.

Contact: Michael Buckner, UMWA at (202) 842-7280 or Joe Corcoran at (301) 439-1832

Other Notable Studies:

Charles River Associates, American Automobile Manufacturers Association, November 1997
Contact: David Montgomery at (202) 662-3800

Department of Energy "11 Labs" Report, DOE, (202) 586-5806, October 1997
Technology Opportunities to Reduce U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Department of Energy "5 Labs" Report, DOE, (202) 586-5806, September 1997
Energy Efficiency and Clean Technologies can produce savings equal to costs

Dr. Stephen S. Fuller, George Mason University Institute of Public Policy; (703) 993-3186,
April 1998
Fiscal Impact of Energy Cost Increases on America's Cities

Dr. David Harrison, National Economics Research Associates, Inc.; (617) 621-0444, 1998
Designing and Implementing Effective International Emissions Trading

Dr. Gary Yohe, Wesleyan University -- for the American Council for Capital Formation;
(202) 293-5811, June 1997
Climate Change Policy, Risk Prioritization and U.S. Economic Growth



These studies were summarized by the Global Climate Coalition.
For more information, contact Frank Maisano at (202) 628-3622.