

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

Overview

It's difficult to believe that our city's planning & development, like so many in Minnesota, the U.S. and the world, has been reorganized to surrender our sovereignty, our right to govern, and our pursuit of happiness & prosperity.

Extreme? That may sound extreme, but take a look at what has happened just since 2009. Many of us found Al Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth" laughably manipulative. We thought time would prove him inconveniently wrong. Which it did! But the lies were told so earnestly for so long that when the farce was exposed, it didn't matter. The Globalist Climate Change movements had already used their power to build the green frameworks that hold us hostage today. Using every tool at their disposal, multinational organizations (UN, World Health Organization, Paris Accord, NGOs, etc.) have successfully implemented their stealthy framework down to the local level.

There's hope... but we need to work together! Through the administration's work in 2025, the changes began to come our way in 2026. There is a lot of information in this document, because the global policy framework has been purposely implemented as a web. The first step to resolving a problem is to understand it.

Climate Action Plans

The primary global initiatives behind **Climate Action Plans (CAPs) in Minnesota cities** stem from international climate agreements, particularly the **2015 Paris Agreement**, channeled through networks of cities, NGOs, and UN-affiliated programs. These efforts promote "think global, act local" by encouraging subnational governments (cities, counties, states) to set emissions reduction targets, conduct GHG inventories, and develop adaptation strategies aligned with global goals like limiting warming to 1.5–2°C.

Key Global Mechanisms & Networks

- **Paris Agreement (2015):** This UN climate accord sets the overarching framework. Many MN city plans explicitly align their goals (e.g., 45% reduction by 2030 and net-zero by 2050) with Paris targets. Local commitments compensate for variable national policies and are tracked internationally.
- **ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability:** A major global network (founded in 1990 as International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives) with thousands of member governments. It provides tools like GHG inventory protocols (e.g., ClearPath software), planning frameworks, and best practices. Minneapolis, Saint Paul, Brooklyn Park, and others in MN have used ICLEI resources for their CAPs.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- **Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy (GCoM):** The world's largest coalition of cities committed to climate action. Minneapolis and Saint Paul are participants, pledging emissions reductions, progress tracking, and resilience planning. It links local efforts to Paris goals and shares data/best practices.
- **Broader UN Initiatives:**
 - **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs/Agenda 2030)** - Especially SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities) and SDG 13 (Climate Action). Minnesota has an SDG 2030 Partnership to localize these.
 - Earlier roots in **Agenda 21** (1992 Earth Summit), which emphasized local sustainability planning ("Local Agenda 21").
 - IPCC reports and UN climate summits (COPs) that stress the role of cities (which account for a large share of global emissions).

Other networks like **C40 Cities** (for major metros) and national programs (e.g., U.S. Conference of Mayors) amplify this by providing templates, funding guidance, and peer benchmarking.

How This Flows to MN Cities

Minnesota cities (e.g., Minneapolis 2013 plan, updates in Saint Paul, Edina, Duluth, Brooklyn Park, and others—over 20 documented) adopt CAPs with similar structures: GHG baselines, sector targets (buildings, transport, energy), equity considerations, and resilience. Many reference state frameworks (e.g., Minnesota Climate Action Framework, aligned with Paris) but draw tools/methodology from global sources.

State-level support (e.g., GreenStep Cities program, grants) reinforces this, but the standardized language, science (IPCC), and urgency ("climate emergency" declarations in multiple MN cities) originate globally. Local plans often cite the need for collective action since climate change is a "global emergency" requiring all levels of government.

In short, it's a **top-down/bottom-up hybrid**: International agreements and city networks set the vision and tools; cities implement tailored plans. This has accelerated in recent years amid federal policy shifts, with MN locals continuing via state, foundation, and network support. Critics sometimes view it as overreach or aligned with broader "sustainable development" agendas, while proponents see it as essential decentralized action.

U. S. has withdrawn. The United States officially withdrew from the Paris Climate Agreement on **January 27, 2026**.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

Quick Timeline

- **2016:** The U.S. joined under President Obama.
- **2020:** Withdrew under President Trump's first term (first withdrawal).
- **2021:** Rejoined under President Biden.
- **January 20, 2025:** On his first day back in office, President Trump signed an executive order directing the U.S. to withdraw again.
- **January 27, 2026:** The withdrawal took effect exactly one year after formal notification to the UN (per the agreement's rules).

The U.S. is the lone country to have left the Paris Agreement twice. It joins a small group of non-parties (such as Iran, Libya, and Yemen at the time of withdrawal).

This federal withdrawal does **not** automatically cancel state and local climate plans (like those in Minnesota cities), which often continue based on their own policies, funding from states/foundations, and participation in city networks like ICLEI or the Global Covenant of Mayors. However, it removes U.S. national commitments, reporting obligations, and international coordination under the agreement.

The state of Minnesota does not require MN cities to have a standalone Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Climate action planning is largely voluntary for most cities, though it is encouraged through state programs, incentives, and targeted requirements in certain areas.

Key Details

- **Statewide:** There is no general mandate requiring all cities (or municipalities) to adopt a dedicated Climate Action Plan. The state's **Climate Action Framework** (updated in 2026) sets overall goals like 50% GHG reduction by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2050, but it relies on voluntary local participation, grants, and collaboration rather than requirements.
- **GreenStep Cities Program:** This is Minnesota's main program for local sustainability and climate efforts (run by the MPCA). It is **entirely voluntary**. Cities choose to participate, implement best practices at their own pace, and can earn recognition (e.g., 1–5 stars). Many cities develop climate plans or goals as part of it, but it's not required.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- **Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (7-county region):** Cities here **must** address climate change in their **comprehensive plans** (updated every 10 years under the Metropolitan Land Planning Act). This includes:
 - Greenhouse gas emissions inventories/projections.
 - Mitigation (emissions reduction) and adaptation/resilience strategies.
 - Alignment with regional goals.

A separate standalone CAP can help meet these requirements (and can be integrated into the comp plan), but it's not mandatory to have one if the comp plan covers the minimum climate elements.

- **Outside the Metro Area:** No comprehensive plan requirement at all for climate (or often in general), unless the city opts in for zoning/land use authority.

In Practice

Many Minnesota cities (especially larger ones like Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, etc.) have adopted CAPs voluntarily, often tied to GreenStep, local priorities, or funding opportunities. The state provides tools, grants, and guidance to support this, but enforcement is limited to the metro comp plan reviews.

In summary, it's a mix of encouragement and localized mandates (mainly metro comp plans) rather than a blanket statewide requirement for every city.

The role of the MPCA (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency).

It is Minnesota's primary state environmental agency, responsible for protecting air, water, land, and addressing climate change.

Key Role in Climate and Local Plans

- **Leads the GreenStep Cities & Tribal Nations program** - The voluntary sustainability initiative I mentioned earlier that many Minnesota cities participate in for climate and energy goals.
- Administers **grants** for local climate action, adaptation planning, and resiliency projects (e.g., Local Climate Action Grants and Climate Resiliency grants).
- Supports implementation of Minnesota's **Climate Action Framework** (carbon reduction and resilience goals).
- Provides technical assistance, tools, and data for cities developing GHG inventories, climate plans, or comprehensive plans.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

In short, when cities in Minnesota create voluntary Climate Action Plans or participate in sustainability programs, the **MPCA** (pca.state.mn.us) is often the main state partner offering guidance, funding, and recognition.

No single authority requires every city in the 7-county Twin Cities Metro area to prepare a standalone 10-year Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Instead, state law requires these cities to update their **comprehensive CAPs** every 10 years, and those plans **must include specific climate mitigation and adaptation elements**. A separate CAP can help satisfy these requirements if integrated properly.

Primary Authority

- **Metropolitan Land Planning Act** (Minnesota Statutes Chapter 473, especially §473.859) — This 1976 law (with key amendments) governs planning in the 7-county metro area (Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington counties).
- **Metropolitan Council** (Met Council) — The regional planning agency that administers the law. It reviews and approves local comp plans for consistency with regional plans (e.g., *Imagine 2050* or its predecessor *Thrive MSP 2040*).

Key Requirements for Climate in Comp Plans

Local comprehensive plans **must** address:

- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory and projections (covering transportation, land use, energy, solid waste, etc.).
- Strategies for mitigation (reducing emissions) and adaptation/resilience to climate impacts.
- Alignment with statewide goals (e.g., 50% GHG reduction by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2050).

These were strengthened by **2023 legislation** (e.g., amendments via bills like SF 2790/HF 2677), which explicitly added climate action to the required content of local comp plans and the Met Council's regional development guide.

Next deadline: Most cities must submit updated 2050 comprehensive plans by around **2028**.

Standalone CAP vs. Comp Plan

- Cities **may** develop a separate Climate Action Plan and incorporate it (or key parts) into their comp plan to meet the minimum requirements.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- The Met Council's *Local Planning Handbook* provides detailed guidance on exactly what climate content is needed.
- Not every city needs a full standalone CAP — the climate elements can be integrated into the comp plan's chapters on land use, transportation, etc.

In short, the **Metropolitan Council**, under the **Metropolitan Land Planning Act** (as amended by the Legislature), is the authority driving this. It's a comprehensive planning mandate with climate requirements built in, not a freestanding CAP mandate for every city.

The EPA has repealed the onerous Climate Control Funding.

The EPA has ruled that federal GHG rules since 2009 have been an overreach, economically harmful, and based on flawed science.

The EPA now prioritizes energy abundance (especially fossil fuels), deregulation, lower costs for consumers, and U.S. competitiveness over mandatory GHG reductions.

Core Position (as of May 2026)

- **Repeal of the 2009 Endangerment Finding (Feb. 12, 2026):** This is the single biggest action. The EPA, under Administrator Lee Zeldin, officially rescinded the Obama-era scientific finding that six greenhouse gases (CO₂, methane, etc.) "endanger public health and welfare." This finding had been the legal foundation for nearly all federal GHG regulations under the Clean Air Act.
 - **Result:** Eliminated all federal GHG emission standards for vehicles (model years 2012–2027+), saving an estimated \$1.3 trillion in regulatory costs.
 - **EPA Administrator, Lee Zeldin**, has called GHG emission standards the "**single largest deregulatory action in U.S. history**" and described the finding as part of the "**climate change religion**" or "**regulatory overreach**."
- **Broader Stance in 2026:**
 - Climate change has been exaggerated and does not justify heavy regulation.
 - Global impact of GHG emissions from U.S. sources (especially vehicles and power plants) has been exaggerated by inaccurate studies.
 - Emphasis on "energy dominance," increasing fossil fuel production, and rejecting "net-zero" or aggressive decarbonization mandates.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- Withdrew from the Paris Agreement again (effective Jan. 2026) and rolled back many Biden-era climate rules.

Practical Effects

- **No new federal GHG limits** on vehicles, power plants, or industry under the **Clean Air Act** (unless Congress acts).
- Focus shifted to criteria pollutants (e.g., smog-forming emissions) rather than climate-focused GHG rules.
- Support for expanded oil, gas, coal, and nuclear — framed as lowering energy prices and creating jobs.

This represents a sharp reversal from prior administrations and aligns with the pro-American energy policy of U.S. Energy Dominance. Critics call it climate denial and harmful to long-term environmental goals; proponents see it as restoring economic sanity and legal limits on EPA power.

NET Zero in the age of Renewable Energy, EVs & AI Data Centers

Impact: \$15+ Trillion to Develop Dangerous, Unreliable Power Generation

Tripple Threat: Massive AI Data Center growth (projected to drive 40–50% of U.S. electricity demand growth through 2030, will push data centers to 8–12% of total U.S. consumption by 2028). Combined with the full elimination of fossil-fuel power generation (~600 GW fleet) and full transition to electric vehicles (~280 million vehicles) creates an unprecedented triple challenge.

Full Cost

\$12+ Trillion in upfront capital over 15–25 years (2026–2050), excluding ongoing operations.

- EV transition: \$4+ trillion (charging infrastructure + distribution grid upgrades for ~10–20% higher peak demand).

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- Fossil power retirement + replacement: \$7+ trillion (new generation, massive overbuild of wind/solar, long-duration storage, and transmission to replace firm baseload while accommodating AI-driven surge of 50–150+ GW by 2028–2035).
- AI-specific add-on: Hundreds of billions to trillions more in dedicated generation, substations, and firming (data centers alone could require 80–150 GW by 2028).

These figures come from National Center for Energy Analytics, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, EIA, and Grid Strategies (2025–2026 data). Costs are front-loaded; electricity prices would rise 6–50% in affected regions due to supply strain.

This does not include many other factors, including increased road renovation & repair to accommodate heavier vehicle weights, and job dislocation from autonomous vehicles.

Full Dislocation Impact

Severe Economic & Social Disruption, Concentrated Geographically by Sector.

- **Job losses:** 1–2 million direct/indirect in fossil extraction, refining, and power plants (coal, oil, gas). Offsets via green jobs (electricians, installers, miners) are possible but geographically mismatched—fossil workers are in rural Midwest/Texas/Appalachia; new roles cluster in coastal manufacturing hubs.
- **Broader effects:** Stranded fossil assets (\$1–2 trillion+), higher energy prices slowing GDP growth (0.1–0.2% drag), supply-chain bottlenecks (copper, transformers), land-use conflicts for renewables, and community economic collapse in fossil-dependent regions.
- **Consumer/household hit:** Rising bills \$400–600+/monthly per household in high-data-center areas) and potential reliability issues during transition.

National Security Vulnerabilities

High & Growing Dependence On China For Critical Supply Chains.

- **China controls 60–99% of Minerals:** Processing/refining for lithium, cobalt, rare earths, gallium, germanium, and solar/battery components—essential for EVs, renewables, grid storage, and data-center backup.
- **Risks:** Supply disruptions, export bans, or sabotage could cripple AI infrastructure, military tech, and grid resilience (e.g., antimony bans already hit backup systems). Data centers and EVs would rely on foreign-controlled batteries/storage.

Origins & Impact of Climate Action Plans

The Hidden Globalist Framework of Local, State & Federal Policy Taxing Us to Shape Our World

- **Grid fragility:** Over-reliance on intermittent renewables + foreign supply chains increases cyber, EMP, and weather vulnerabilities in a high-AI-demand environment. Eliminating domestic fossil baseload removes dispatchable “always-on” resilience.

In short, this scenario delivers massive upfront costs, concentrated economic pain, and elevated strategic risks - particularly with AI’s relentless 24/7 power needs outpacing clean-firm generation buildout. Proponents see long-term savings and innovation; critics highlight engineering limits, cost overruns, and security trade-offs. Real-world outcomes depend heavily on permitting speed, nuclear/gas bridging, and mineral diversification.