WEBVTT - https://subtitletools.com

 $00:00:00.492 \rightarrow 00:00:03.492$ (students chatting)

00:00:04.640 --> 00:00:07.070 - [Kai] Yeah, I think we can start now.

 $00:00:07.910 \rightarrow 00:00:11.230$ And so welcome everyone to today's seminar,

 $00{:}00{:}11.230$ --> $00{:}00{:}14.230$ hosted by the Yale Center on Climate Change and Health.

00:00:14.230 --> 00:00:17.550 So, I'm Dr. Kai Chan,

00:00:17.550 --> 00:00:20.090 Assistant Professor of the EHS Department.

 $00:00:20.090 \dashrightarrow 00:00:23.120$ I'm also the Director of Research for the center.

 $00:00:23.120 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.960$ So today, we are very honored and prepared

 $00{:}00{:}24.960$ --> $00{:}00{:}29.960$ to have Dr. Lewis Ziska come to give us today's lecture.

 $00:00:30.690 \dashrightarrow 00:00:34.550$ So Dr. Ziska is a professor at the Mailman School

 $00{:}00{:}34.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}36.560$ of Public Health at Columbia University.

 $00{:}00{:}36{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}41{.}331$ So before joining Columbia, he was a senior scientist

 $00{:}00{:}41.331$ --> $00{:}00{:}45.450$ at the US Department of Agriculture for nearly 25 years.

 $00:00:45.450 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.620$ So he's one of the most leading experts

 $00{:}00{:}48.620$ --> $00{:}00{:}53.060$ on the effects of climate change on plants and a griculture.

 $00{:}00{:}53.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}56.317$ So, without further ado, let's welcome Dr. Ziska.

00:00:56.317 --> 00:00:59.470 (students applauding)

00:00:59.470 --> 00:01:00.370 - [Lewis] Thank you, Professor Chan,

 $00:01:00.370 \rightarrow 00:01:02.423$ I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

 $00:01:04.070 \rightarrow 00:01:06.099$ The good news is you've got free food.

 $00:01:06.099 \rightarrow 00:01:07.070$ (students laughing)

 $00{:}01{:}07{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}09{.}870$ The bad news is you've got to listen to me lecture so...

00:01:13.062 --> 00:01:16.580 I wanted to look at the nexus between climate change,

 $00:01:16.580 \rightarrow 00:01:19.430$ rise in carbon dioxide and public health

 $00:01:19.430 \rightarrow 00:01:22.570$ and just sort of give you a sense of the range

 $00:01:22.570 \rightarrow 00:01:25.720$ of different consequences associated with it.

 $00{:}01{:}25{.}720$ --> $00{:}01{:}30{.}697$ So we have the good, we have the bad, and we have the OMG.

00:01:31.890 --> 00:01:34.670 So, I want to go through and talk about some of the work

 $00{:}01{:}34.670$ --> $00{:}01{:}38.200$ that we've been doing on all of these different aspects.

00:01:38.200 --> 00:01:40.260 Before I do that, however, I wanna make sure

 $00:01:40.260 \rightarrow 00:01:42.980$ that we're all on the same page when it comes

 $00{:}01{:}42.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}47.290$ to defining what we mean by climate change.

 $00{:}01{:}47.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51.530$ So, we know that carbon dioxide is going up.

 $00:01:51.530 \rightarrow 00:01:55.890$ This is a recent Keeling Curve, where you can see $00:01:55.890 \rightarrow 00:01:59.513$ that we're getting close to about 410 parts per million.

 $00{:}02{:}00{.}690$ --> $00{:}02{:}03{.}660$ In my lifetime, the amount of carbon dioxide is increased

 $00:02:03.660 \dashrightarrow 00:02:07.850$ by about 30% and the reason why is not difficult.

 $00{:}02{:}07{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}10{.}860$ It turns out that if you take a carbon source,

 $00:02:10.860 \rightarrow 00:02:13.763$ fossil fuel source, and you oxidize it, you burn it,

 $00:02:14.760 \rightarrow 00:02:18.107$ carbon-oxygen, yeah carbon dioxide, who knew?

00:02:19.105 --> 00:02:21.480 So, if you look at, this is a little bit out of date,

 $00{:}02{:}21.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}24.360$ but if you look at where the carbon dioxide comes from,

 $00{:}02{:}24.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}28.070$ again, oxidation of fossil fuels and cement production

 $00:02:28.070 \rightarrow 00:02:30.820$ in calcium carbonate, one of the offshoots

 $00{:}02{:}30{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}33{.}600$ of calcium carbonate is carbon dioxide.

 $00:02:33.600 \rightarrow 00:02:35.630$ Land use change, where does it go?

 $00{:}02{:}35{.}630$ --> $00{:}02{:}39{.}270$ About 50% of it stays in the atmosphere, about 25% of it

00:02:39.270 --> 00:02:41.880 goes back in the land through photosynthesis,

00:02:41.880 --> 00:02:44.640 and about 25% of it is dissolved into the oceans

 $00:02:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.090$ where carbon dioxide and water

 $00:02:46.090 \rightarrow 00:02:47.913$ is formed (mumbling) acid.

 $00:02:48.850 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.690$ Okay, so...

 $00:02:51.690 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.510$ here are as we know,

 $00:02:54.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.400$ this particular change is recent.

 $00{:}02{:}58{.}400$ --> $00{:}03{:}01{.}000$ This is the highest carbon dioxide that we've experienced,

00:03:01.000 - 00:03:03.470 at least in the last million years.

 $00:03:03.470 \dashrightarrow 00:03:05.860$ We know where it comes from, where is it gonna go?

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}860$ --> $00{:}03{:}08{.}927$ Well, depends on which model you happen to believe in.

00:03:08.927 --> 00:03:11.020 And I won't go through all the different models.

 $00{:}03{:}11.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12.520$ We'll look at the green one down here.

 $00{:}03{:}12{.}520$ --> $00{:}03{:}15{.}880$ We'll call this every one drive a Prius and Hans model,

 $00:03:15.880 \rightarrow 00:03:18.820$ and that so far is not working out.

 $00:03:18.820 \rightarrow 00:03:21.460$ We have the business as usual model here,

 $00{:}03{:}21{.}460$ --> $00{:}03{:}25{.}240$ and that may not be working out because that's depending on

 $00{:}03{:}25{.}240$ --> $00{:}03{:}28{.}720$ a certain amount of coal usage, and that's been going down,

 $00{:}03{:}28{.}720$ --> $00{:}03{:}31{.}830$ but there's still a bit of uncertainty about the fact,

 $00:03:32.937 \rightarrow 00:03:34.610$ particularly in regards to methane,

 $00:03:34.610 \rightarrow 00:03:36.460$ but there's no question that it's going up.

 $00:03:36.460 \rightarrow 00:03:38.027$ If we just do the rule of thumb, it's going up

 $00:03:38.027 \rightarrow 00:03:40.190$ two to three parts per million per year.

00:03:40.190 --> 00:03:43.410 We have about 80 years left, so it can range anywhere

 $00{:}03{:}43{.}410$ --> $00{:}03{:}47{.}313$ from 160 to 240 parts per million higher than it is today.

 $00:03:49.190 \rightarrow 00:03:52.450$ Okay, so why should you give a flying fig

 $00:03:52.450 \rightarrow 00:03:55.620$ whether carbon dioxide is 300 or 400 or 500,

 $00:03:55.620 \rightarrow 00:03:58.180$ what difference does it make, right?

00:03:58.180 --> 00:03:59.177 Well, it makes two differences.

 $00:03:59.177 \rightarrow 00:04:02.920$ The first one has to do with the physical aspects

 $00:04:02.920 \rightarrow 00:04:06.116$ of increasing these particular gases.

 $00{:}04{:}06{.}116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}09{.}600$ We know that the atmosphere consists of certain gases.

00:04:09.600 --> 00:04:13.150 Most of those we are familiar with, but there are two

 $00:04:13.150 \rightarrow 00:04:16.063$ that we consider to be global warming gases.

 $00:04:17.500 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.290$ What does that mean exactly?

 $00:04:19.290 \dashrightarrow 00:04:21.790$ What makes it a global warming gas?

 $00{:}04{:}21.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}23.940$ Well, to answer that question,

 $00:04:23.940 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.843$ I will, of course, turn to music.

 $00{:}04{:}26{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}30{.}060$ How many of you have ever played a string instrument?

 $00:04:30.060 \rightarrow 00:04:32.363$ Excellent, so I'm gonna turn this over to you.

 $00:04:34.200 \rightarrow 00:04:36.250$ Suppose for the sake of argument

00:04:36.250 --> 00:04:40.830 that I tune two strings to the same frequency, okay?

00:04:40.830 --> 00:04:42.950 Let's say A 440 Hertz, all right?

 $00:04:42.950 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.820$ So you have two strings

 $00:04:43.820 \dashrightarrow 00:04:45.960$ that are tuned to the same frequency,

 $00{:}04{:}45{.}960$ --> $00{:}04{:}49{.}273$ and I pluck one string, what will the string next to it do?

00:04:51.833 --> 00:04:53.010 - [Female Voice] Suddenly vibrate?

00:04:53.010 --> 00:04:54.690 - [Lewis] It'll vibrate, it'll resonate, it'll absorb

 $00{:}04{:}54{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57{.}110$ some of the energy from the first string.

00:04:57.110 --> 00:04:59.543 What if I'm a Methodist, will that still work?

00:05:00.870 --> 00:05:01.703 - [Student] Yes.

00:05:02.570 --> 00:05:04.479 - [Lewis] What if I'm a republican?

 $00:05:04.479 \rightarrow 00:05:05.630$ (student laughing)

 $00:05:05.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.463$ - [Student] Yes.

 $00{:}05{:}06{.}463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}07{.}900$ - [Lewis] Are you telling me that the laws of physics

```
00{:}05{:}07{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09{.}750 are independent of religious denomination
```

 $00:05:09.750 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.840$ and political affiliation?

00:05:10.840 --> 00:05:12.816 Oh my god, you have no idea.

 $00:05:12.816 \rightarrow 00:05:13.649$ (students laughing)

00:05:13.649 --> 00:05:15.930 Oh wait, no, that isn't how it works, is it?

00:05:15.930 --> 00:05:17.730 Sorry, I've been in DC for too long.

00:05:18.910 --> 00:05:20.160 Yeah, no it's absolutely true.

 $00:05:20.160 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.510$ So, what does this have to do

 $00:05:21.510 \rightarrow 00:05:22.760$ with being a global warming gas?

 $00:05:22.760 \rightarrow 00:05:27.760$ Well, it turns out that in addition to music,

 $00:05:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.800$ molecules also resonate.

 $00:05:30.800 \dashrightarrow 00:05:33.910$ They don't resonate in the key of A,

 $00:05:33.910 \rightarrow 00:05:37.490$ but they resonate in the key of infrared, or heat.

 $00{:}05{:}37{.}490$ --> $00{:}05{:}40{.}800$ So whenever heat is experienced by one of these molecules,

 $00:05:40.800 \rightarrow 00:05:43.360$ it resonates, it absorbs some of that energy

 $00{:}05{:}43{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}48{.}030$ that would otherwise be lost, does that make sense?

 $00:05:48.030 \rightarrow 00:05:50.110$ Good, this has taken an entire semester

 $00:05:50.110 \rightarrow 00:05:51.343$ of physics and atmospheric chemistry

 $00{:}05{:}51{.}343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}53{.}443$ into five minutes so please for give me.

 $00:05:55.040 \rightarrow 00:05:57.100$ - [Lewis] So the two major greenhouse gases

 $00{:}05{:}57{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}00{.}470$ are carbon dioxide and water vapor, humidity, if you will.

00:06:00.470 --> 00:06:01.660 All right?

 $00:06:01.660 \rightarrow 00:06:05.180$ So as this change in carbon dioxide occurs,

 $00:06:05.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.590$ that's not a bad thing because

 $00:06:07.590 \rightarrow 00:06:10.140$ there's a natural greenhouse effect.

 $00{:}06{:}10{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13{.}990$ If there were no carbon dioxide, the average temperature

 $00{:}06{:}13{.}990$ --> $00{:}06{:}17{.}560$ on the earth would be about minus 80 degrees Celsius.

00:06:17.560 --> 00:06:20.903 So, by having carbon dioxide, by having water vapor,

00:06:22.010 -> 00:06:23.943 you have a livable environment.

 $00:06:24.820 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.657$ But I think you can see that

 $00:06:25.657 \dashrightarrow 00:06:29.490$ this sort of a Goldilocks principle that occurs here, right?

 $00:06:29.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.243$ Too little, too much.

 $00:06:32.700 \rightarrow 00:06:35.603$ So, we're seeing the earth warm up,

 $00{:}06{:}36{.}660$ --> $00{:}06{:}39{.}580$ but it's not warming up the same everywhere, is it?

 $00:06:39.580 \rightarrow 00:06:42.650$ Some areas are warming up faster than others.

 $00:06:42.650 \rightarrow 00:06:44.120$ Why?

 $00:06:44.120 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.170$ Well, if it was the sun, then the equator

 $00:06:46.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.140$ would be warming up very fast.

00:06:49.140 --> 00:06:51.383 It's not, what's warming up the fastest?

 $00:06:53.000 \rightarrow 00:06:55.090$ What area of the world is warming up quickly?

00:06:55.090 --> 00:06:57.790 - [Male Student] The poles. - [Lewis] The poles.

00:06:57.790 --> 00:06:59.290 They get the least amount of sun,

00:06:59.290 --> 00:07:01.203 how come they're warming up so quickly?

00:07:03.270 --> 00:07:06.256 Wait a minute, I said there were two, there were two

00:07:06.256 --> 00:07:09.214 greenhouse gases, weren't there?

 $00:07:09.214 \rightarrow 00:07:12.350$ And, water vapor's one of the greenhouse gases,

 $00:07:12.350 \rightarrow 00:07:16.350$ so where on the globe is water vapor dominant,

 $00:07:16.350 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.873$ the dominant greenhouse gas?

 $00:07:21.560 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.490$ Where's the air warming unit?

00:07:23.490 --> 00:07:25.709 I'm not trying to trick you.

00:07:25.709 --> 00:07:28.290 - [Female Student] Equator? - [Lewis] At the equator.

 $00{:}07{:}28.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32.700$ So at the equatorial regions, where it's warm and wet,

00:07:32.700 --> 00:07:33.940 you already have water vapor,

 $00:07:33.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.990$ it's the dominant greenhouse gas.

00:07:35.990 --> 00:07:39.090 Adding more CO2, yeah, it's gonna get warmer and wetter.

00:07:39.090 --> 00:07:40.720 Is it gonna rise very quickly?

 $00:07:40.720 \rightarrow 00:07:43.450$ No, it takes a lot more energy to move something

 $00:07:43.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.190$ that has a lot of water in it, right?

 $00:07:45.190 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.540$ Because water absorbs heat.

 $00:07:48.560 \rightarrow 00:07:51.763$ Okay, so we got a big change in the tropics.

 $00:07:52.750 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.710$ Where is the air dry

 $00{:}07{:}56.150$ --> $00{:}07{:}58.530$ and therefore adding more carbon dioxide would be

 $00{:}07{:}58{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01{.}623$ the primary driver, in terms of surface temperatures?

 $00{:}08{:}03.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04.520$ You already mentioned one.

 $00{:}08{:}08{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09{.}743$ The Poles.

 $00{:}08{:}12.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}16.290$ When the air is cold, is does not pull a lot of water vapor

 $00{:}08{:}16.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}18.580$ and therefore adding more carbon dioxide is going to have

 $00:08:18.580 \rightarrow 00:08:21.700$ a major effect in terms of surface temperatures.

 $00:08:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:08:23.723$ Where else is the air dry?

00:08:28.613 --> 00:08:29.446 - [Student] The surface. - [Lewis] I'm really not

 $00{:}08{:}29{.}446$ --> $00{:}08{:}33{.}088$ trying to trick you, this is just basic high school biology.

 $00:08:33.088 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.140$ - [Student] The desert.

00:08:34.140 --> 00:08:34.973 - [Lewis] Pardon?

00:08:34.973 --> 00:08:35.880 - [Student] Someone said desert.

00:08:35.880 --> 00:08:37.820 - [Lewis] Deserts, excellent.

 $00:08:37.820 \rightarrow 00:08:38.653$ Deserts.

 $00{:}08{:}39{.}512$ --> $00{:}08{:}41{.}490$ So what do we expect to see with more carbon dioxide?

00:08:41.490 --> 00:08:43.410 Increased desertification, right?

00:08:43.410 --> 00:08:44.860 Deserts are gonna get bigger.

 $00:08:45.720 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.560$ Makes sense so far?

00:08:47.560 --> 00:08:49.877 Okay, gonna add a little bit more to this.

00:08:49.877 --> 00:08:53.160 If you go up in elevation and altitude,

 $00:08:53.160 \rightarrow 00:08:55.430$ as you move up in altitude the air becomes dryer,

 $00:08:55.430 \rightarrow 00:08:56.980$ therefore there is gonna be a major shift

 $00:08:56.980 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.570$ in terms of temperature.

 $00:08:58.570 \rightarrow 00:09:01.360$ Seasonally, which season, summer or winter,

 $00:09:01.360 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.610$ has the highest humidity?

00:09:04.520 --> 00:09:05.830 - [Student] Summer.

00:09:05.830 --> 00:09:07.910 - [Lewis] Connecticut, is it hotter and wetter

 $00:09:07.910 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.403$ in July or in December?

00:09:12.662 --> 00:09:14.520 - [Student One] December. - [Student Two] July.

00:09:14.520 --> 00:09:15.943 - [Lewis] Again, I'm not trying to trick you, okay?

00:09:15.943 --> 00:09:17.610 All right, it's July.

00:09:17.610 --> 00:09:20.083 The summer is warmer and wetter, so the fact is 00:09:20.083 --> 00:09:23.050 that temperature is gonna happen more in the winter

 $00{:}09{:}23.050$ --> $00{:}09{:}27.200$ than it is in the summer, and that's what we're seeing okay?

 $00:09:27.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.940$ So, here's the technical message.

00:09:29.940 --> 00:09:34.000 If water vapor is high, it's the dominant warming gas,

 $00:09:34.000 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.670$ and there's less effect of CO2.

 $00:09:36.670 \rightarrow 00:09:40.100$ If the water vapor is low, adding more CO2

 $00:09:40.100 \rightarrow 00:09:43.040$ will have a differential higher effect

 $00:09:43.040 \rightarrow 00:09:44.890$ with respect to surface temperatures.

 $00{:}09{:}46{.}040$ --> $00{:}09{:}48{.}720$ Again, I've taken an entire semester and given five minutes,

 $00{:}09{:}48.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}51.570$ but you can hopefully adjust to this, there's more to it.

 $00{:}09{:}52{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}55{.}660$ So, let's look at it from the plant biology point of view.

00:09:55.660 --> 00:09:57.893 Okay, warmer temperatures, well,

 $00:09:59.020 \rightarrow 00:10:01.380$ we know that greater temperature increase

 $00{:}10{:}01{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}04{.}370$ with latitude or altitude, based on what I've talked about,

00:10:04.370 --> 00:10:07.160 increased desertification, increased drought,

 $00{:}10{:}07{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}10{.}150$ rise in sea levels from increased polar and glacial melt.

 $00:10:10.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.410$ Okay?

00:10:11.410 --> 00:10:13.260 So, what's warm is gonna get warmer,

 $00:10:13.260 \rightarrow 00:10:15.000$ what's wet is gonna get wetter,

 $00:10:15.000 \rightarrow 00:10:17.580$ and we see these changes going on, right?

00:10:17.580 --> 00:10:21.083 That's the indirect effect of rise in carbon dioxide.

 $00{:}10{:}22.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.010$ Now, let me tell you the other direct effect,

 $00:10:25.010 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.380$ or the only direct effect,

 $00:10:26.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.290$ and that is plants are essential to life.

 $00:10:28.290 \rightarrow 00:10:30.170$ What do plants need in order to grow?

00:10:32.830 --> 00:10:33.663 - [Student One] Sunlight.

00:10:33.663 --> 00:10:35.570 - [Lewis] Sunlight, excellent, thank you so much

 $00:10:35.570 \rightarrow 00:10:37.020$ for sitting in the front row.

00:10:37.900 --> 00:10:40.680 Water, light, nutrients, right?

00:10:40.680 --> 00:10:43.060 They need all kinds of nutrients;

00:10:43.060 --> 00:10:45.950 your nitrogen, your phosphorous, your potassium.

 $00{:}10{:}45{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}47{.}483$ What's the fourth thing they need?

00:10:48.452 --> 00:10:49.820 - [Students] CO2.

00:10:49.820 --> 00:10:51.373 - Carbon dioxide, right?

 $00:10:53.760 \rightarrow 00:10:56.703$ Okay, let's do this as a thought experiment.

 $00{:}10{:}57.630$ --> $00{:}11{:}02.160$ Suppose for the sake of argument that phosphorous, okay,

 $00:11:02.160 \rightarrow 00:11:03.840$ that the amount of phosphorous had gone up

 $00:11:03.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.340$ in every soil around the world by 30%.

00:11:07.340 --> 00:11:09.603 By 30% in your lifetime.

 $00:11:10.960 \rightarrow 00:11:13.110$ Would that have an effect on plant biology?

00:11:15.300 --> 00:11:16.610 Yeah, of course.

00:11:16.610 --> 00:11:19.770 There are over 400, 000 different species of plants.

 $00{:}11{:}19{.}770$ --> $00{:}11{:}22{.}905$ Would all plants respond the same way to that effect?

00:11:22.905 --> 00:11:24.155 - [Student] No.

 $00{:}11{:}25{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}27{.}550$ - [Lewis] And as plants are the foundation or the basis

 $00:11:27.550 \rightarrow 00:11:29.940$ for life on the planet, for they're

 $00:11:29.940 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.770$ the bottom of the food chain,

 $00:11:31.770 \rightarrow 00:11:34.260$ are there gonna be ramifications of that?

00:11:34.260 --> 00:11:35.093 Oh, hell yes!

 $00{:}11{:}38{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}43{.}043$ Here's one of them, I got this from the Exxon Mobil website.

 $00{:}11{:}43{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}45{.}270$ Now that provides strength

 $00{:}11{:}46{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47{.}887$ but this is lovely fine.

 $00:11:47.887 \rightarrow 00:11:50.187$ And you can see lovely fine you can (mumbles).

 $00:11:52.153 \rightarrow 00:11:55.250$ Well look at that, that is so cool.

 $00:11:55.250 \rightarrow 00:11:56.400$ I've only find Rosemary

 $00:11:57.350 \rightarrow 00:11:59.200$ when you give it more carbon dioxide.

 $00:12:00.580 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.010$ If you're a forester you understand that the faster

 $00:12:03.010 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.880$ the tree grows the weaker the wood.

 $00{:}12{:}04.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}07.830$ But you told me that as ide from that wasn't on the website.

00:12:10.080 --> 00:12:11.333 Oh, hey,

 $00{:}12{:}12{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14{.}490$ this is Kazoo.

 $00:12:14.490 \rightarrow 00:12:16.150$ Anybody from the southern US?

00:12:16.150 --> 00:12:17.710 Anybody experienced Kazoo firsthand?

00:12:17.710 --> 00:12:19.490 Yeah, I know.

 $00:12:19.490 \rightarrow 00:12:22.043$ We did not in the front doorstep or in the morning.

 $00:12:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.660$ This is an invasive vine

 $00:12:24.660 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.060$ and it also responds to carbon dioxide.

00:12:27.060 --> 00:12:29.807 Wow, this is one of the worst weeds in the United,

00:12:29.807 --> 00:12:32.270 am sorry, I keep saying weeds,

 $00{:}12{:}32{.}270$ --> $00{:}12{:}35{.}660$ the current administration term is alternative crop.

00:12:35.660 --> 00:12:38.170 So I don't wanna confuse anybody, okay?

 $00:12:38.170 \rightarrow 00:12:41.843$ All right, so this also responds to carbon dioxide.

 $00{:}12{:}43.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}44.960$ Well what are the consequences

 $00:12:44.960 \rightarrow 00:12:47.540$ of this direct effect of rising CO2?

 $00:12:47.540 \rightarrow 00:12:49.647$ Well, it's a fundamental resource for plant growth

 $00{:}12{:}49{.}647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}53{.}010$ and all plants are gonna be beneficial to human society.

 $00{:}12{:}53.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}55.030$ Not all plants respond the same way

 $00{:}12{:}55{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}56{.}270$ and rising CO2 alters

 $00:12:56.270 \rightarrow 00:12:58.253$ the qualitative components of plants.

 $00:13:00.560 \rightarrow 00:13:03.360$ Nobody talks about this because CO2

 $00{:}13{:}03{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}05{.}780$ is plant food and everything is wonderful and good,

 $00:13:05.780 \rightarrow 00:13:07.690$ and everything's gonna be great.

 $00:13:07.690 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.790$ Doesn't work that way.

 $00:13:09.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.510$ So let's look at the good.

00:13:11.510 --> 00:13:13.610 Let's take the good part first, all right?

 $00:13:14.490 \rightarrow 00:13:16.340$ All of you are familiar with malaria.

00:13:17.430 --> 00:13:20.110 About 400, 000 deaths primarily in

00:13:20.110 --> 00:13:23.783 Sub-Saharan, Saharan regions.

 $00:13:23.783 \rightarrow 00:13:28.260$ It's a tremendous and awful storage disease.

 $00{:}13{:}30{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}34{.}720$ So, one of the ways in which it is dealt with

 $00:13:36.400 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.400$ is through this particular plant.

00:13:41.720 --> 00:13:45.273 This is Artemisia annua or sweet Annie, okay?

00:13:46.145 --> 00:13:49.800 It has been used in Chinese medicine for hundreds of years

 $00{:}13{:}49{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52{.}333$ as a means to combat malaria.

 $00{:}13{:}53{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55{.}700$ It produces this compound artemisinin

 $00:13:57.000 \rightarrow 00:13:59.740$ which has this wonderful peroxide bridge

00:13:59.740 --> 00:14:02.743 which is important in terms of killing Plasmodium,

 $00:14:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.953$ the carrier for malaria.

00:14:07.680 --> 00:14:10.100 So, it is part of what are considered

 $00:14:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.140$ to be artemisinin combination therapies

 $00:14:12.140 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.700$ which is still the primary means

 $00:14:13.700 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.040$ to respond to malaria globally.

 $00:14:16.040 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.630$ And what they do in this is

 $00:14:17.630 \rightarrow 00:14:19.530$ they take artemisinin compounds,

 $00:14:19.530 \rightarrow 00:14:22.380$ they add different one or two longer acting drugs,

 $00:14:22.380 \rightarrow 00:14:24.700$ usually from the quinine family, they add it

 $00{:}14{:}24{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}27{.}590$ to the artemisinin and that's a means to prevent or

 $00:14:27.590 \rightarrow 00:14:29.750$ to help you get over the malaria.

 $00{:}14{:}29{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}750$ And just from a sort of an atomical point of view,

 $00:14:35.110 \rightarrow 00:14:38.176$ the glandular secretion, the trichomes in artemisia

 $00:14:38.176 \rightarrow 00:14:40.260$ when you have a little closer look, that's where

 $00:14:40.260 \rightarrow 00:14:42.320$ your artemisinin is being produced.

 $00:14:42.320 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.460$ Okay.

 $00:14:43.460 \rightarrow 00:14:46.490$ So obviously, the question I gotta ask is,

00:14:46.490 --> 00:14:49.800 if CO2 stimulates plant growth,

 $00{:}14{:}49{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}51{.}950$ what does it do for artemisinin production?

00:14:52.990 --> 00:14:57.220 And we worked with a group at Nanjing University

 $00{:}14{:}57{.}220$ --> $00{:}15{:}00{.}600$ at the National Academy, the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

 $00{:}15{:}00{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}03{.}893$ And they have a FACE of free CO2 enrichment system.

 $00:15:04.840 \rightarrow 00:15:06.980$ We were looking at the artemisinin content

00:15:06.980 --> 00:15:09.650 as a function of carbon dioxide

 $00:15:09.650 \rightarrow 00:15:11.710$ and function of the carbon:nitrogen ratio.

 $00:15:11.710 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.810$ So you could use this elemental analysis

 $00:15:13.810 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.470$ of carbon and nitrogen as a means

 $00:15:15.470 \rightarrow 00:15:17.650$ to predict how much our artemisinin

 $00:15:17.650 \rightarrow 00:15:20.083$ was being produced by give a plant.

 $00:15:21.140 \rightarrow 00:15:26.140$ And then Chan Jiu who was my colleague there,

 $00:15:26.210 \rightarrow 00:15:29.280$ went to different herbarium around China

 $00:15:29.280 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.780$ to look at artemisinin, to collect it

 $00:15:31.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.100$ and to do this C:M ratio.

 $00:15:34.100 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.389$ So we have collections that vary from

 $00:15:37.389 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.560$ 1900 to 2005, 2006.

 $00{:}15{:}41{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}45{.}523$ And during this time period, carbon dioxide has risen,

00:15:46.739 --> 00:15:48.160 in sort of a logarithmic fashion,

 $00:15:48.160 \dashrightarrow 00:15:49.860$ slow at first and then increasing.

 $00:15:50.950 \rightarrow 00:15:52.720$ Is there a connection between this rise

 $00:15:52.720 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.990$ in carbon dioxide and the change in

 $00{:}15{:}56{.}010$ --> $00{:}15{:}59{.}160$ the estimated artemisinin concentration produced?

 $00:15:59.160 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.100$ And we think there is.

 $00:16:01.100 \rightarrow 00:16:04.430$ Here's the carbon dioxide levels here in the curve,

 $00{:}16{:}04{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}07{.}200$ and here is the estimated artemisinin concentration

 $00:16:07.200 \rightarrow 00:16:10.070$ that we're seeing for this as a function of decade,

 $00:16:10.070 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.670$ as a function of carbon dioxide.

00:16:12.800 --> 00:16:14.670 In fact, what they're doing now is that

 $00{:}16{:}14.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19.550$ the are forwarding greenhouses where our AC is growing,

00:16:19.550 --> 00:16:21.650 adding more carbon dioxide as a means

 $00:16:21.650 \rightarrow 00:16:24.950$ to increase artemisinin production now.

 $00:16:24.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.600$ So this is a good thing.

 $00{:}16{:}26{.}600$ --> $00{:}16{:}29{.}190$ It's a way of increasing a chemical compound produced

 $00{:}16{:}29{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}33{.}180$ by leaves that we know has a positive effect with respect

 $00:16:33.180 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.340$ to malarial

 $00:16:36.565 \rightarrow 00:16:38.300$ concentrations,

 $00:16:38.300 \rightarrow 00:16:40.993$ trying to cure your malarial symptoms.

 $00{:}16{:}42{.}200$ --> $00{:}16{:}45{.}770$ So from the good point of view, Artemisia annua by the way,

00:16:45.770 --> 00:16:49.460 is a common weed in North America, is a central

00:16:49.460 --> 00:16:51.570 pharmacological resource to treat malaria in Africa

 $00{:}16{:}51{.}570$ --> $00{:}16{:}54{.}238$ Recent increases in atmospheric CO2 are associated with

 $00:16:54.238 \rightarrow 00:16:56.104$ the increase of a known anti-malarial drug

 $00:16:56.104 \rightarrow 00:16:57.880$ derived from this plant.

00:16:57.880 --> 00:17:00.080 What other plant-based drugs are responding?

 $00:17:03.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.033$ Don't know?

 $00{:}17{:}05{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}06{.}033$ You need find out.

00:17:09.200 --> 00:17:10.700 Let me give you the bad, okay?

 $00:17:12.018 \rightarrow 00:17:13.410$ This is something I've been working on for

 $00:17:13.410 \rightarrow 00:17:15.030$ a number of years and has to do with pollen.

 $00{:}17{:}15{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}17{.}730$ How many of you suffer from seasonal pollen allergies?

 $00:17:18.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.100$ Raise your hand, excellent.

 $00:17:20.100 \rightarrow 00:17:22.650$ Okay, so basically the plants that are

 $00{:}17{:}22.650$ --> $00{:}17{:}25.290$ associated with seasonal pollen all ergies sort of fall

00:17:25.290 --> 00:17:28.250 into three major taxa; you have trees in the spring,

 $00:17:28.250 \rightarrow 00:17:30.060$ weeds and grasses in the summertime

 $00:17:30.060 \rightarrow 00:17:32.147$ and Ragweed in the fall (mumbles).

 $00:17:34.190 \rightarrow 00:17:37.130$ So we went through and looked at how again,

 $00:17:37.130 \rightarrow 00:17:40.020$ how is carbon dioxide affecting pollen production

 $00:17:40.020 \rightarrow 00:17:43.240$ from ragweed during sampling of catkins.

 $00:17:43.240 \rightarrow 00:17:44.863$ Here are some of the early work that we did,

 $00{:}17{:}44.863 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}47.470$ this is great chamber work where we were lowering

 $00:17:47.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.510$ the carbon dioxide values to pre-industrial levels

 $00{:}17{:}50{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}52{.}701$ and all the time back in the 90s

 $00:17:52.701 \rightarrow 00:17:54.240$ and then projecting to 600

00:17:54.240 --> 00:17:57.580 which will almost certainly occur in the century.

 $00:17:57.580 \rightarrow 00:18:01.000$ And this is the overall plant biomass for ragweed

 $00:18:01.000 \rightarrow 00:18:03.670$ of the branch per plant basis.

 $00:18:03.670 \rightarrow 00:18:05.780$ Here's the pollen production going for

00:18:05.780 --> 00:18:08.770 280 to 370 double pollen production,

00:18:08.770 --> 00:18:11.350 going from 370 to 600 double as you can.

 $00:18:11.350 \rightarrow 00:18:14.488$ And hey, not only was an increase in growth

00:18:14.488 --> 00:18:16.330 but only increasing in terms of pollen production,

 $00:18:16.330 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.179$ but also in terms of the antigen Amb a1

 $00{:}18{:}19{.}179 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}22{.}350$ based on the ELISA test where going as an increase

 $00:18:22.350 \rightarrow 00:18:24.500$ as carbon dioxide went up as well.

 $00:18:24.500 \rightarrow 00:18:27.070$ We haven't been able to replicate this, by the way.

 $00{:}18{:}27{.}070$ --> $00{:}18{:}29{.}680$ So that's another challenge for you young researchers

 $00:18:29.680 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.320$ that are out there.

00:18:31.320 --> 00:18:34.410 But, there's pretty good indication

 $00:18:34.410 \rightarrow 00:18:36.773$ that ragweed has this kind of respond.

 $00:18:37.810 \rightarrow 00:18:39.940$ Yeah, yeah, all the interesting doctors

 $00:18:39.940 \rightarrow 00:18:41.060$ has good interesting stuff,

 $00:18:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.973$ but it's a chamber study.

 $00:18:43.980 \rightarrow 00:18:44.970$ It's a chamber study,

 $00:18:44.970 \rightarrow 00:18:48.120$ doesn't add any relevance in the real world.

00:18:48.120 --> 00:18:49.560 What's wrong with you?

 $00{:}18{:}49{.}560$ --> $00{:}18{:}52{.}110$ Okay, how do we get from the lab to the real world?

00:18:53.040 --> 00:18:55.980 Okay, well, there's, I showed you

00:18:57.020 --> 00:19:00.520 was talking about FACE, FACE free air CO2 enrichment.

 $00{:}19{:}00{.}520$ --> $00{:}19{:}03{.}240$ This is the Duke University FACE which was funded

 $00:19:03.240 \rightarrow 00:19:05.270$ by the Department of Energy as we refer to it

00:19:05.270 --> 00:19:08.270 in federal circles, the department that everything,

 $00:19:08.270 \rightarrow 00:19:09.870$ they had lots and lots of money.

 $00:19:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.420$ So this is the rain.

00:19:14.420 --> 00:19:17.470 This is pushing in carbon dioxide

 $00:19:17.470 \rightarrow 00:19:21.330$ to the low valley pine forest showed you the effect

 $00:19:21.330 \rightarrow 00:19:23.910$ of CO2 on low valley earlier.

 $00:19:23.910 \rightarrow 00:19:26.020$ This is an afterward, it turns out that

 $00{:}19{:}27.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}28.920$ plants do respond differently, you know the plant that

 $00:19:28.920 \rightarrow 00:19:31.240$ responded the most with this change?

 $00:19:31.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.690$ Within the forest understudy?

 $00:19:34.072 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.197$ Of course you don't.

00:19:36.197 --> 00:19:38.620 I'm sorry (mumbles)

 $00:19:40.550 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.407$ There's a problem here.

 $00{:}19{:}41{.}407 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}44{.}543$ The problem for me was this cost \$5 million a year.

 $00{:}19{:}45{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}48{.}663$ My entire discretionary budget at the time was \$2, 000.

00:19:50.030 --> 00:19:52.470 I could hire it for maybe five minutes,

 $00:19:52.470 \longrightarrow 00:19:54.120$ but that's not really gonna work.

00:19:55.090 --> 00:19:58.061 So, I kind of like,

00:19:58.061 -> 00:19:59.393 how do I take it from the lab,

 $00:20:01.098 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.650$ to the real world, how do I do that?

00:20:03.650 --> 00:20:05.067 How do I do that?

 $00:20:07.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.853$ Hang on a second.

00:20:10.120 --> 00:20:11.870 Let's go back to the Keeling curve.

00:20:13.450 --> 00:20:15.250 Why did they measure this in Hawaii?

00:20:17.150 --> 00:20:19.780 I mean, I like Hawaii.

 $00:20:19.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.043$ It's got great factories.

 $00{:}20{:}22{.}140$ --> $00{:}20{:}25{.}263$ Why would you measure carbon dioxide background in Hawaii?

00:20:27.160 --> 00:20:28.289 - [student] High elevation

00:20:28.289 --> 00:20:29.380 and well background carbon dioxide?

00:20:29.380 --> 00:20:30.870 - [Lewis] Exactly.

00:20:30.870 --> 00:20:31.890 Exactly.

 $00{:}20{:}31.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}34.030$ So you're measuring the background carbon dioxide,

 $00{:}20{:}34.030$ --> $00{:}20{:}36.750$ you're not measuring the carbon dioxide in the room here,

 $00:20:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.130$ which I chose over the camp 11.

 $00{:}20{:}39{.}130$ --> $00{:}20{:}41{.}960$ Or if I go out in the street and measure carbon dioxide.

 $00:20:41.960 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.433$ So that gave me an idea.

 $00{:}20{:}45{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49{.}000$ Yeah, so most geological, geographically isolated spot

00:20:49.000 --> 00:20:50.330 on Americans have high emissions,

 $00:20:50.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.163$ but

 $00{:}20{:}52{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}57{.}500$ maybe we could use an urban-rural transect as a means

00:20:57.910 --> 00:21:02.040 to simulate what future environment would be like.

00:21:02.040 --> 00:21:05.780 If I move the temperature and a carbon dioxide transect

 $00{:}21{:}05{.}780$ --> $00{:}21{:}10{.}030$ along this line from an organic farm in Western Maryland

 $00{:}21{:}10{.}030$ --> $00{:}21{:}13{.}620$ to downtown Baltimore, we dug the plots and moved the soil,

 $00{:}21{:}13.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}16.332$ we made the soil uniform at the same seabed

 $00:21:16.332 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.000$ and so the seed was the same.

00:21:18.000 --> 00:21:20.703 We monitor all this fairly carefully.

00:21:21.570 --> 00:21:23.180 And I'm sorry, as an academic,

 $00:21:23.180 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.540$ I gotta show you at least one slide

 $00{:}21{:}24{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}25{.}970$ that nobody in the back row can read.

 $00:21:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.680$ So this is my contribution to that.

00:21:28.680 --> 00:21:30.880 And so try to go through it.

00:21:30.880 --> 00:21:34.550 This is daytime CO2, early 2000s.

 $00:21:34.550 \rightarrow 00:21:38.180$ It does go up with going from rural to sub-urban.

00:21:38.180 --> 00:21:39.560 Night-time temperatures go up,

 $00:21:39.560 \rightarrow 00:21:42.750$ season light goes up the number of forestry days.

 $00:21:42.750 \rightarrow 00:21:44.730$ Now there are some day time temperature,

 $00{:}21{:}44.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}46.690$ now there's some concerns here.

 $00:21:46.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.720$ One of them is ozone.

 $00:21:48.720 \rightarrow 00:21:51.200$ Well, it turns out that when you had an ozone,

 $00:21:51.200 \rightarrow 00:21:53.560$ day in downtown Baltimore, within four hours,

00:21:53.560 --> 00:21:56.293 you got the same ozone occurring at the rural site.

 $00:21:57.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.533$ So we didn't think that was too much of an issue.

 $00{:}22{:}00{.}400$ --> $00{:}22{:}03{.}220$ Yeah, we did get more hydrogen deposited and rainfall

 $00{:}22{:}03{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}05{.}690$ for the urban side relative to the rural side.

 $00:22:05.690 \rightarrow 00:22:09.370$ But the soil that we took out to each location

 $00:22:09.370 \rightarrow 00:22:11.150$ already had a great deal of nitrogen in it,

00:22:11.150 - 00:22:13.660 it was firm, so from the same source.

 $00:22:13.660 \rightarrow 00:22:16.380$ So we don't think that was too much of a problem.

 $00:22:16.380 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.860$ So maybe we could use this.

 $00:22:18.860 \rightarrow 00:22:21.583$ Since there we are, two meters by two meters,

 $00:22:22.620 \rightarrow 00:22:24.560$ digging down into the soil, if you look closely,

00:22:24.560 --> 00:22:26.137 you'll see Jenny Hopper (mumbles).

 $00:22:27.540 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.693$ Okay, so we did that.

 $00:22:30.290 \rightarrow 00:22:34.010$ And we packed the soil, the seed bank down,

 $00:22:34.010 \longrightarrow 00:22:36.830$ we took out our railroad samplers here

 $00:22:36.830 \rightarrow 00:22:39.880$ to monitor falling around each of the sites.

 $00:22:39.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.075$ And hey, cool.

 $00:22:43.075 \rightarrow 00:22:46.940$ We got in the farm site, the rural site years

 $00{:}22{:}46{.}940$ --> $00{:}22{:}49{.}330$ here's when the rag weed first showed up, the pollen first

 $00{:}22{:}50{.}239 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}54{.}377$ showed up around day of year to sometime in September,

 $00:22:54.377 \rightarrow 00:22:56.340$ peaked and then went down.

 $00:22:56.340 \rightarrow 00:23:00.840$ Okay, now, these two lines here, these two arrows,

 $00{:}23{:}00{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}04{.}820$ are the start of the maximum pollen based on the farm side,

 $00:23:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.570$ sort of out of control.

00:23:06.570 - 00:23:08.290 And you can see it if I go to the

 $00{:}23{:}08{.}290$ --> $00{:}23{:}12{.}450$ to the semi rural, the sub-urban areas starting earlier

 $00{:}23{:}12{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}15{.}850$ and maximizing the warmer when we get to the cities.

 $00:23:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.567$ Holy cow!

 $00:23:17.567 \rightarrow 00:23:20.270$ The individual ragweed plant in the city

 $00:23:20.270 \rightarrow 00:23:22.580$ with more CO2 with more temperature

00:23:22.580 --> 00:23:25.040 and a longer growing seasons producing on average

 $00{:}23{:}25{.}040$ --> $00{:}23{:}28{.}963$ 10 times more pollen than the one out in the country.

00:23:30.820 --> 00:23:33.053 Wow, okay.

00:23:33.053 --> 00:23:34.990 That was a cheap way of getting a featured climate

 $00:23:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.913$ to see what ragweed might do.

00:23:37.770 --> 00:23:40.040 Yeah, okay, that's interesting,

 $00:23:40.040 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.500$ but it's a global problem here.

00:23:42.500 --> 00:23:44.727 Yeah, it's a global climate change.

 $00:23:44.727 \rightarrow 00:23:47.163$ How do we scale up from this?

00:23:48.070 --> 00:23:51.960 Well, I use a very sophisticated instrument

 $00:23:51.960 \rightarrow 00:23:54.223$ on my desk called telephone.

 $00{:}23{:}55{.}300$ --> $00{:}23{:}57{.}630$ And I called up different all ergists and medical doctors

00:23:57.630 --> 00:23:58.677 and said, "Hi, you don't know me,

00:23:58.677 --> 00:23:59.857 "but I'm a plant physiologist

00:23:59.857 --> 00:24:02.680 "from USK Oh, no, don't hang up, don't hang up.

00:24:02.680 --> 00:24:04.067 "Hi, am a plant physio you don't know me,

 $00:24:04.067 \rightarrow 00:24:05.427$ "but would you be interested?

00:24:05.427 --> 00:24:07.807 "Oh, you would, okay, great, hang on."

 $00:24:08.760 \rightarrow 00:24:12.730$ So what we did is we got allergists

00:24:12.730 --> 00:24:15.380 and other pollen counters across the central part of

 $00{:}24{:}15{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}20{.}010$ the United States to look and see whether there had been

 $00:24:20.010 \rightarrow 00:24:23.470$ a change in temperature that could be associated $00:24:23.470 \rightarrow 00:24:25.930$ with the change of pollen season for ragweed.

00.24.25.410 --> 00.24.25.550 with the change of ponch season for ragweed.

 $00{:}24{:}25{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}28{.}020$ Now, we didn't look at rag weed numbers per se

 $00{:}24{:}28{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}30{.}420$ in terms of the amount of pollen just whether or not

 $00{:}24{:}30{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}31{.}920$ the season have been affected.

 $00:24:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.330$ And so what we found was beginning in the 1990s.

 $00{:}24{:}37{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}39{.}341$ And if you start down here remember

 $00:24:39.341 \rightarrow 00:24:43.250$ remember that humidity CO2 paradigm?

00:24:43.250 - 00:24:45.030 Right here, it's warm and wet.

 $00:24:45.030 \rightarrow 00:24:46.510$ We're not expecting a big change

00:24:46.510 --> 00:24:48.970 in recent decades in terms of temperature,

 $00:24:48.970 \rightarrow 00:24:51.640$ but it shouldn't expand as you move northward.

 $00:24:51.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.493$ And that's kind of what we saw.

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}58{.}450$ That now going up into the northern part of the US

 $00{:}24{:}58{.}450$ --> $00{:}25{:}02{.}580$ that from 95 to 2013 there's hardly has been a significant

 $00:25:02.580 \rightarrow 00:25:04.793$ increase in the ragweed pollen season.

 $00{:}25{:}06{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}09{.}870$ Okay, well, we've gone from the lab, we've gone to the city,

 $00:25:09.870 \rightarrow 00:25:14.050$ we've gone to the country, lets do the world.

00:25:14.050 - 00:25:15.147 Now when I called up they said,

00:25:15.147 --> 00:25:18.720 "Oh, I have a paper and PNAS, please listen to me."

 $00{:}25{:}18.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}19.797$ And they would list en.

 $00:25:19.797 \rightarrow 00:25:22.163$ "So yeah soil paper that's really interesting.

00:25:22.163 --> 00:25:23.407 "We wanna help you.

00:25:23.407 --> 00:25:24.760 "Great."

 $00{:}25{:}24.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}28.830$ Okay, so started getting data this is from Turku, Finland.

 $00:25:28.830 \rightarrow 00:25:31.273$ One of the longest pollen seasons that we had.

00:25:31.273 - > 00:25:33.260 This is total seasonal pollen,

 $00:25:33.260 \rightarrow 00:25:36.653$ in terms of grains per cubic meter over time.

00:25:38.290 --> 00:25:42.023 Reykjavik, Iceland, grains per cubic meter over time.

 $00{:}25{:}44.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47.290$ Kansas City, Missouri, we've since found out

00:25:47.290 --> 00:25:50.240 this probably not correct because it's a long story,

 $00:25:50.240 \rightarrow 00:25:51.500$ but they got a new pollen counter,

 $00:25:51.500 \rightarrow 00:25:53.900$ it was much better in counting pollen (mumbles).

 $00:25:55.990 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.220$ Geneva Switzerland.

00:25:57.220 --> 00:25:58.500 Okay, you're seeing, if you're seeing,

 $00:25:58.500 \rightarrow 00:26:03.230$ I think it's fair to say a trend here, a global trend.

00:26:03.230 --> 00:26:04.340 Right?

 $00{:}26{:}04{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}06{.}730$ So basically, we went out on a lab

 $00:26:06.730 \rightarrow 00:26:08.840$ and looked at the change in pollen load,

 $00:26:08.840 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.720$ the amount of pollen over the end of the season

 $00:26:10.720 \rightarrow 00:26:13.050$ as a function of different temperatures.

 $00{:}26{:}13.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}16.430$ And where there was some good significant correlations here

 $00:26:16.430 \rightarrow 00:26:20.340$ in terms of, based on locations around the world.

 $00{:}26{:}20{.}340$ --> $00{:}26{:}23{.}480$ But all of these locations are in the northern hemisphere.

 $00{:}26{:}23{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26{.}130$ So our next goal is to go to the southern hemisphere.

 $00:26:27.280 \rightarrow 00:26:30.023$ And we're working on that now, so stay tuned.

00:26:31.340 --> 00:26:32.740 Alright,

 $00{:}26{:}32{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36{.}100$ so that rising CO2 temperatures

00:26:36.100 --> 00:26:38.323 can influence pollen season falling amounts.

 $00:26:39.360 \rightarrow 00:26:41.680$ Pollen allergenicity, we're still not sure,

 $00:26:41.680 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.150$ we have one laboratory data.

 $00{:}26{:}44{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}133$ Maybe, maybe not, we need to do more work on that, right?

 $00:26:48.184 \rightarrow 00:26:49.017$ Okay.

 $00:26:51.311 \rightarrow 00:26:53.400$ Let's go to the OMG part.

 $00:26:53.400 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.630$ Right, this is...

 $00{:}26{:}55{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}57{.}490$ What's the role of carbon dioxide

 $00{:}26{:}57{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}59{.}860$ if the trees are growing bigger and there's more water

 $00:26:59.860 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.110$ available, does that affect fire frequencies?

00:27:03.120 --> 00:27:03.953 I don't know.

 $00:27:04.880 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.260$ Is it possible it's affecting

00:27:06.260 --> 00:27:09.330 the qualitative component of the woods such as burning

 $00:27:09.330 \rightarrow 00:27:12.690$ the higher climate change or more CO2?

 $00:27:12.690 \rightarrow 00:27:15.380$ Is it affecting the air pollution pollen?

00:27:15.380 --> 00:27:18.133 I don't know, nobody's said a word.

00:27:20.913 --> 00:27:23.073 We talked about Kazoo earlier, well Kazoo when you give it

00:27:23.073 --> 00:27:25.030 more carbon dioxide, generates

 $00:27:25.030 \rightarrow 00:27:27.280$ more volatile organic compounds.

 $00:27:27.280 \rightarrow 00:27:30.033$ Has that shifted in the last 20 years of more CO2?

00:27:31.090 --> 00:27:31.923 I don't know.

 $00:27:33.260 \rightarrow 00:27:35.220$ Well, what about contact dermatitis

 $00:27:35.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.490$ from something like poison ivy?

 $00{:}27{:}36{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38{.}610$ We actually know this one, I mentioned that this was

 $00:27:38.610 \rightarrow 00:27:40.460$ the one that was growing more

 $00:27:40.460 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.890$ in the FACE system in the deep forest.

 $00{:}27{:}42.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}45.710$ It actually produces a more virulent form of urishiol.

 $00{:}27{:}45.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}47.891$ You get contact dermatitis faster

 $00:27:47.891 \rightarrow 00:27:50.900$ when you come in contact with it.

 $00:27:50.900 \rightarrow 00:27:52.023$ What about narcotics?

 $00:27:53.030 \rightarrow 00:27:54.400$ We spend billions of dollars a year

00:27:54.400 - 00:27:56.073 trying to eradicate narcotics.

00:27:57.430 --> 00:27:59.530 How is CO2, how is climate affecting

 $00:27:59.530 \rightarrow 00:28:02.034$ where these narcotics are growing?

 $00:28:02.034 \rightarrow 00:28:03.117$ I don't know.

 $00:28:04.390 \longrightarrow 00:28:06.520$ What about food allergies?

 $00{:}28{:}06{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}08{.}890$ If I'm changing the quality of the composition of the food

 $00:28:08.890 \rightarrow 00:28:11.506$ is it affecting the number of food allergies?

00:28:11.506 --> 00:28:13.050 I don't know.

 $00:28:14.490 \rightarrow 00:28:16.250$ Food safety, hey,

00:28:16.250 --> 00:28:18.700 everybody gets sick from eating food occasionally.

00:28:18.700 --> 00:28:19.850 Turns out warmer temperatures

 $00:28:19.850 \rightarrow 00:28:22.230$ can promote pathogen infestation.

 $00:28:22.230 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.290$ Oh no, who knew?

 $00{:}28{:}24{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}26{.}480$ Is climate change or rise in carbon dioxide

 $00:28:26.480 \rightarrow 00:28:28.263$ affecting food safety?

00:28:29.330 --> 00:28:30.470 I don't know.

 $00{:}28{:}32{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34{.}490$ Funding for all of these things from the federal government

 $00:28:34.490 \longrightarrow 00:28:37.650$ is, yeah.

 $00:28:37.650 \rightarrow 00:28:39.643$ Nobody's doing anything worse.

 $00:28:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.120$ Here's some work we did do.

 $00:28:43.120 \rightarrow 00:28:46.490$ This is kind of thistle highly invasive species.

 $00:28:46.490 \rightarrow 00:28:48.890$ This is being sprayed with glyphosate,

 $00{:}28{:}48{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52{.}320$ the recommended rates under ambient CO2 that's being sprayed

 $00:28:52.320 \rightarrow 00:28:55.557$ with glyphosate under 650 parts per million CO2.

 $00:28:55.557 \rightarrow 00:28:57.373$ And added absolutely no control.

 $00:28:59.230 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.362$ The reason why, is that

 $00:29:01.362 \rightarrow 00:29:02.330$ when you give them more carbon dioxide,

 $00{:}29{:}02{.}330$ --> $00{:}29{:}04{.}620$ there was a difference between how much would accumulate

 $00{:}29{:}04.620$ --> $00{:}29{:}07.260$ on the top and how much accumulated in the roots.

00:29:07.260 --> 00:29:10.190 It did not, one of the things that glyphosate does is

 $00{:}29{:}10{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}13{.}030$ it travels, it's systemic, it goes everywhere in the plant.

 $00{:}29{:}13.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}17.520$ But if I have more roots, it was diluted out

 $00:29:17.520 \rightarrow 00:29:20.700$ and roots can generate new shoots, et cetera.

 $00{:}29{:}20.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22.310$ So what's the effect of carbon dioxide

 $00:29:22.310 \rightarrow 00:29:25.040$ and climate change on pesticide usage?

00:29:25.040 --> 00:29:26.373 Pesticide ethicacy?

 $00:29:27.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.780$ We know about this much.

 $00{:}29{:}32{.}080$ --> $00{:}29{:}35{.}970$ If there is a green revolution, if there is a green new deal

 $00:29:37.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.780$ these are the things that we need to focus on.

00:29:42.480 --> 00:29:44.780 Let's work on one of these issues.

 $00:29:44.780 \rightarrow 00:29:46.762$ There's not enough time to go into all of them.

 $00:29:46.762 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.726$ Let's look at nutrition.

 $00:29:48.726 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.876$ And let's look at rice.

 $00{:}29{:}51{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}55{.}050$ Rice is consumed on a daily basis by

 $00:29:55.050 \rightarrow 00:29:56.300$ about two billion people.

 $00:29:58.000 \rightarrow 00:30:01.080$ About 600 million people get more than 50%

 $00:30:01.080 \rightarrow 00:30:03.053$ of their daily food intake from rice.

 $00{:}30{:}05{.}690$ --> $00{:}30{:}08{.}920$ Rice, wheat, corn, they're what we call the big three

 $00:30:08.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.890$ that account half of the calories that you consume

 $00:30:10.890 \rightarrow 00:30:13.330$ and I would be willing to bet all my life savings

 $00{:}30{:}13{.}330$ --> $00{:}30{:}16{.}230$ that you're consuming at least one of them for this lunch.

00:30:17.560 --> 00:30:19.480 There's pretty good evidence that projected

00:30:19.480 --> 00:30:22.003 increases in CO2 reduce proteins.

 $00:30:23.152 \rightarrow 00:30:24.240$ Some of the first work that I did back

00:30:24.240 --> 00:30:26.543 at the International Rice Research Institute,

 $00{:}30{:}27{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}31{.}330$ doing open top chamber work with different temperatures.

00:30:31.330 --> 00:30:34.600 For the 94 wet season, our percent protein was about

 $00:30:34.600 \rightarrow 00:30:38.420 \ 10\%$ of ambient CO2, we had a CO2 it dropped

 $00:30:38.420 \rightarrow 00:30:42.100 9.3\%$, the dry season similar response

 $00{:}30{:}42.100$ --> $00{:}30{:}47.100$ in terms of temperature per se, reduced protein levels,

 $00:30:47.440 \rightarrow 00:30:50.570$ but it did not interact with carbon dioxide to,

 $00{:}30{:}50{.}570$ --> $00{:}30{:}53{.}920$ in any kind of synergistic to reduce levels even more so

 $00:30:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.257$ it was a separate effect.

00:30:56.170 --> 00:30:58.520 The change in protein is ongoing.

 $00:30:58.520 \rightarrow 00:31:00.060$ We looked at future changes.

 $00{:}31{:}00{.}060$ --> $00{:}31{:}04{.}500$ This is recent changes from 300 to 400 parts per million

 $00:31:04.500 \rightarrow 00:31:07.360$ for about eight different rice lines.

00:31:07.360 --> 00:31:09.110 And here I think eight of the nine

 $00:31:09.110 \rightarrow 00:31:12.230$ showed a decline or significant decline

 $00:31:12.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:14.463$ in protein concentration for the rice.

 $00{:}31{:}15{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}18{.}680$ And we had to stop this because our funding got hold

 $00:31:18.680 \dashrightarrow 00:31:20.313$ when new administration came in.

 $00:31:22.230 \rightarrow 00:31:25.440$ It's ubiquitous, here's some work by Taub.

 $00{:}31{:}25{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}27{.}517$ Here was in Texas and this is looking at

00:31:27.517 --> 00:31:31.710 annual crop staples; barley, rice, wheat, soybean, potato.

00:31:31.710 --> 00:31:34.040 This is the number of studies,

 $00{:}31{:}34.040$ --> $00{:}31{:}36.480$ average and standard deviation.

00:31:36.480 --> 00:31:38.930 This is the percent change in protein concentration

 $00{:}31{:}38{.}930$ --> $00{:}31{:}43{.}143$ under elevated CO2 which range from about 600 to 700.

 $00:31:44.440 \rightarrow 00:31:46.930$ All of them declined with the exception of soybean.

 $00:31:46.930 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.720$ Soybean is a legume, that's to say

 $00:31:48.720 \longrightarrow 00:31:50.620$ it fixes its own nitrogen.

 $00:31:50.620 \rightarrow 00:31:53.540$ So when you add more CO2, it's not affected.

 $00{:}31{:}53{.}540$ --> $00{:}31{:}57{.}350$ So soybean, peanut, other leguminous plants do not show

 $00:31:57.350 \dashrightarrow 00:32:00.553$ that change in terms of proteins with more carbon dioxide.

 $00{:}32{:}03{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}06{.}810$ This is some work by a colleague Irakli Loladze,

 $00:32:06.810 \dashrightarrow 00:32:09.010$ he went through and looked at the Sweden country

00:32:09.010 --> 00:32:12.930 of all the different elements in the context of rising CO2,

 $00:32:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.470$ the average of about 690.

 $00:32:15.470 \rightarrow 00:32:18.780$ And what we see is that this very rapid rise

 $00{:}32{:}18.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}23.780$ in carbon dioxide is causing plants to be carbon rich,

 $00:32:24.330 \rightarrow 00:32:27.113$ but nutrient poor across the board.

 $00:32:28.180 \rightarrow 00:32:30.430$ And we think there are ramifications of that.

00:32:31.730 --> 00:32:34.373 So it's not just crops.

 $00{:}32{:}35{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38{.}467$ We're looking at at personal work that is done by me,

 $00:32:38.467 \rightarrow 00:32:40.550$ or that is done by Augustine and all,

 $00:32:40.550 \rightarrow 00:32:42.367$ came out recently looking at pasture grass

 $00:32:42.367 \rightarrow 00:32:45.630$ that have been grown under elevated CO2.

 $00{:}32{:}45{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}48{.}290$ And what effect this had in terms of

 $00:32:48.290 \rightarrow 00:32:51.110$ weight being put on by the cattle.

 $00:32:51.110 \rightarrow 00:32:53.430$ And this is a seven year average,

 $00{:}32{:}53{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}56{.}660$ we're looking at ambient CO2, ambient temperature;

 $00:32:56.660 \rightarrow 00:32:58.980$ ambient CO2, elevated temperature

 $00{:}32{:}58{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}00{.}510$ and then the two bars on the right

 $00{:}33{:}00{.}510$ --> $00{:}33{:}04{.}272$ are elevated carbon dioxide to different temperatures.

00:33:04.272 --> 00:33:08.080 20% nitrogen which is a proxy for percent protein

 $00:33:08.080 \dashrightarrow 00:33:11.570$ declined significantly with more carbon dioxide.

 $00{:}33{:}11{.}570$ --> $00{:}33{:}14{.}810$ The animals put on weight, took them longer to put on

 $00{:}33{:}14.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}17.550$ the same amount of weight, they were slower growing.

00:33:17.550 --> 00:33:20.510 So there's pretty good evidence across the board 00:33:20.510 --> 00:33:24.040 that plants are responding by reducing protein levels.

 $00:33:24.040 \rightarrow 00:33:25.390$ That's going to have ramifications

00:33:25.390 --> 00:33:27.640 in terms of human nutrition, direct consumption,

 $00{:}33{:}27.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}29.190$ but also in terms of livestock.

00:33:30.740 --> 00:33:32.860 Hey, but it's just people food, right?

 $00:33:32.860 \rightarrow 00:33:35.513$ Well, no, not necessarily.

 $00{:}33{:}37{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}39{.}170$ We decided to look at bees.

00:33:39.170 --> 00:33:40.840 And turns out that, you know,

 $00:33:40.840 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.250$ bees also have nutritional requirements

 $00:33:42.250 \rightarrow 00:33:45.850$ that are important in the context of agriculture.

 $00:33:45.850 \rightarrow 00:33:48.798$ So they get their carbs from nectar.

 $00:33:48.798 \rightarrow 00:33:51.190$ Understandable, so then they do this,

 $00:33:51.190 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.712$ they're really good at it.

 $00:33:52.712 \rightarrow 00:33:53.820$ They do the little waggle dance.

 $00:33:53.820 \rightarrow 00:33:55.800$ You know, the little waggle dance

00:33:55.800 --> 00:33:56.907 the bee says to the other bee,

 $00{:}33{:}56{.}907 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}59{.}077$ "Hey, you know if you go right behind this building,

00:33:59.077 - 00:34:01.937 "there's a sunflower there, 20 feet to the left

00:34:01.937 --> 00:34:04.190 "
of the dumpster and you'll find all the carbs you want."

 $00:34:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.810$ They're really good at that.

 $00:34:05.810 \rightarrow 00:34:08.770$ They're not so good in terms of pollen yet pollen

00:34:08.770 --> 00:34:10.430 is their main source of protein, $00:34:10.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.000$ they get 10 essential amino acids $00:34:12.000 \rightarrow 00:34:14.440$ from the pollen that they consume. $00:34:14.440 \rightarrow 00:34:17.330$ So again, we wanted to see okay well carbon dioxide $00:34:17.330 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.480$ is affecting protein, $00:34:18.480 \rightarrow 00:34:20.913$ is this in fact affecting bee nutrition? 00:34:22.870 --> 00:34:24.130 And let's do it from a point of view $00:34:24.130 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.690$ of the recent changes that occur. $00:34:26.690 \rightarrow 00:34:28.650$ That's a tough one to get to. $00:34:28.650 \rightarrow 00:34:32.660$ How did we, we chose Goldenrod because Goldenrod $00:34:32.660 \rightarrow 00:34:35.250$ is one of the last sources of pollen that bees see $00:34:35.250 \rightarrow 00:34:37.000$ in the fall before they overwinter. $00:34:38.040 \rightarrow 00:34:39.910$ I won't go through all the machinations we did $00:34:39.910 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.760$ to come up with that, but it is. $00:34:42.760 \rightarrow 00:34:45.960$ And so it's important for bees before they overwinter $00:34:45.960 \rightarrow 00:34:49.017$ to have a good source of protein, and one of those good 00:34:49.017 --> 00:34:50.730 source is Goldenrod so we considered it $00:34:50.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.780$ to be a key for the species. 00:34:52.780 --> 00:34:54.280 So what I'm trying to do is sort of two $00:34:54.280 \rightarrow 00:34:56.020$ lines of evidence here and I wanna give you $00:34:56.020 \rightarrow 00:34:58.280$ the historical evidence first. 00:34:58.280 --> 00:34:59.370 And they got this through, 00:34:59.370 --> 00:35:01.630 this Smithsonian Natural History Museum. 00:35:01.630 --> 00:35:04.250 Now, I don't know if you've ever been to DC but it's a great 00:35:04.250 --> 00:35:06.170 place to go to, you got your dinosaurs, 00:35:06.170 --> 00:35:08.637 you got your elephants, you got your little diamonds, $00:35:08.637 \rightarrow 00:35:10.730$ it's a great place to go, right?

00:35:10.730 --> 00:35:15.730 Okay, but here's the thing, way in the back in the basement,

00:35:16.750 --> 00:35:18.560 right next to the Ark of the Covenant,

00:35:18.560 --> 00:35:21.960 you'll find all these, okay (mumbles)

 $00:35:22.970 \rightarrow 00:35:26.490$ You'll find all these plants samples, right?

 $00{:}35{:}26{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}30{.}183$ They go back to pre industrial times in the 1850s, 1860s.

 $00:35:31.400 \rightarrow 00:35:33.263$ And those samples included Goldenrod.

 $00{:}35{:}34{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}38{.}655$ So we're able to actually take the pollen,

 $00:35:38.655 \rightarrow 00:35:41.640$ the stigmas, the reproductive parts,

 $00{:}35{:}41.640$ --> $00{:}35{:}46.640$ and to look at the carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen ratios.

 $00{:}35{:}47.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}48.950$ Nitrogen as a proxy again for protein.

 $00:35:50.000 \dashrightarrow 00:35:52.080$ Now, I wanna give you a second line here.

 $00:35:52.080 \rightarrow 00:35:52.983$ This is the experimental evidence.

 $00:35:52.983 \rightarrow 00:35:55.820$ This is some work that was done by my colleague,

 $00:35:55.820 \rightarrow 00:35:58.040$ a scientist down in the Temple, Texas.

 $00:35:58.040 \rightarrow 00:36:02.420$ He's since retired but this is a really cool study,

 $00:36:02.420 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.793$ waiting kind of for guy.

 $00:36:05.040 \rightarrow 00:36:07.253$ Kind of circle wagons that you see here.

 $00:36:08.140 \rightarrow 00:36:10.520$ What Wayne did is, he added carbon dioxide

 $00{:}36{:}10.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}12.260$ at one end of the wagon.

 $00{:}36{:}12{.}260$ --> $00{:}36{:}14{.}550$ And because of photo-sensors and because it's Texas

00:36:14.550 --> 00:36:17.135 where the sun's shining all the time,

 $00:36:17.135 \rightarrow 00:36:19.330$ by the time you got to the bottom wagon,

 $00:36:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.450$ all that carbon dioxide have been taken out.

 $00{:}36{:}21.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}23.720$ So they were looking at carbon dioxide levels

00:36:23.720 --> 00:36:27.624 pre-industrial, right 283 hundred.

 $00{:}36{:}27.624$ --> $00{:}36{:}30.850$ And we were very fortunate to have just enough goldenrod

 $00:36:30.850 \rightarrow 00:36:32.280$ growing along that trans sector

 $00:36:32.280 \rightarrow 00:36:35.110$ that we could actually look at the numbers.

 $00:36:35.110 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.200$ So here are the data.

 $00:36:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.730$ This is historical data from the Smithsonian.

 $00:36:39.730 \rightarrow 00:36:42.760$ This is the estimated protein based on

 $00:36:42.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.870$ using nitrogen as a proxy.

 $00{:}36{:}44{.}870$ --> $00{:}36{:}49{.}270$ And going from the pre-industrial time to the current time,

 $00:36:49.270 \rightarrow 00:36:51.580$ which is the beginning of the 21st century.

 $00{:}36{:}51{.}580$ --> $00{:}36{:}56{.}200$ We see about a 30% drop in the nitrogen protein content

 $00{:}36{:}57{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59{.}643$ and an increase, corresponding increase in carbon

 $00:36:59.643 \rightarrow 00:37:02.450$ and the nitrogen of that pollen.

 $00:37:02.450 \rightarrow 00:37:05.090$ And for the experimental evidence,

 $00:37:05.090 \rightarrow 00:37:07.487$ numbers are slightly different.

 $00{:}37{:}07{.}487 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}09{.}940$ There's a lot of the sampling so the larger the bigger,

 $00:37:09.940 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.870$ but basically the same sort of response;

 $00:37:12.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.840$ that as you increase the carbon dioxide,

 $00{:}37{:}14.840$ --> $00{:}37{:}18.790$ you're decreasing the amount of protein in the pollen.

 $00:37:18.790 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.923$ That has effects in terms of the health.

00:37:23.880 --> 00:37:25.950 And these are already under environmental,

 $00:37:25.950 \rightarrow 00:37:28.120$ number of environmental stressors.

 $00:37:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.600$ How's it affecting that?

 $00:37:29.600 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.290$ We don't know.

 $00{:}37{:}31{.}290$ --> $00{:}37{:}33{.}650$ We're not able to get funding to continue this work.

 $00:37:33.650 \rightarrow 00:37:35.970$ But we think it's a toe in the water stage

 $00:37:35.970 \rightarrow 00:37:37.280$ where we think it's really interesting

 $00:37:37.280 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.730$ we want to do more if we can.

 $00:37:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.580$ Let's go back to people food for a moment.

 $00:37:42.580 \dashrightarrow 00:37:45.060$ And let's look a little more deeper into rice.

 $00{:}37{:}45{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}48{.}740$ This is work that was done two different FACE of free air

00:37:48.740 --> 00:37:50.537 C02 reference systems,

 $00:37:50.537 \rightarrow 00:37:53.210$ one in Scuba Japan, which is shown here,

00:37:53.210 --> 00:37:56.330 another one in near Nanjing, China.

00:37:56.330 --> 00:37:58.450 And again, you're going your rice, you're

 $00:37:58.450 \rightarrow 00:38:01.313$ ejecting carbon dioxide into a field situation.

00:38:02.400 --> 00:38:05.330 They did this, we did this under different cultivars,

00:38:05.330 --> 00:38:08.010 rice cultivars, eight different cultivars in Japan,

 $00{:}38{:}08{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}11{.}550$ most of the Japonica lines, some of the (mumbles) lines

 $00:38:11.550 \rightarrow 00:38:14.480$ and then also in China which had a wider range

00:38:14.480 - 00:38:17.750 in terms of indica, hybrids and so forth.

 $00:38:17.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.830$ So the 18 different lines altogether

 $00:38:19.830 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.940$ was the percent protein.

 $00:38:21.940 \rightarrow 00:38:24.240$ Again, this is, the differences now,

 $00{:}38{:}24{.}240$ --> $00{:}38{:}26{.}582$ were about 550 parts per million, which is the elevated 400,

 $00{:}38{:}26{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}31{.}083$ which is the ambient for all the lines.

 $00{:}38{:}31{.}920$ --> $00{:}38{:}35{.}420$ Percent change relative to ambient CO2, again trying

 $00:38:35.420 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.825$ to decline in protein for the rice.

00:38:38.825 --> 00:38:40.780 You look at iron and zinc,

 $00{:}38{:}40{.}780$ --> $00{:}38{:}44{.}260$ a little more scattered, but again many of the lines,

00:38:44.260 --> 00:38:45.870 showing a significant

 $00:38:45.870 \rightarrow 00:38:48.270$ and rice overall showing a significant decrease.

 $00{:}38{:}49{.}230$ --> $00{:}38{:}51{.}530$ Now, we wanted to delve a little bit deeper and look at it

 $00{:}38{:}51{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54{.}763$ in terms of the vitamin content.

 $00{:}38{:}55{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}58{.}250$ And we didn't have this for all the different samples but

 $00:38:58.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.770$ for the Chinese ones.

- 00:38:59.770 --> 00:39:03.153 So B1 vitamin, B1, B2, B5 and B9.
- 00:39:04.160 --> 00:39:06.230 And I haven't had time to go through all
- $00:39:06.230 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.430$ the stats on, there's a whole,
- $00{:}39{:}08{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}09{.}670$ there were significant effects
- $00:39:09.670 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.720$ in terms of all these declining
- $00:39:12.720 \rightarrow 00:39:15.580$ as you increase the carbon dioxide, okay?
- $00:39:15.580 \rightarrow 00:39:19.910$ And then we got this out of the blue, the response,
- $00:39:19.910 \rightarrow 00:39:22.900$ it went up for alpha tocopherol, okay?
- 00:39:22.900 --> 00:39:26.383 Vitamin E went up with more CO2.
- 00:39:28.950 --> 00:39:30.930 So I was scratching my various body parts
- $00:39:30.930 \rightarrow 00:39:34.150$ trying to figure out what the hell is this about?
- 00:39:34.150 --> 00:39:35.623 What's going on, okay?
- $00:39:37.430 \rightarrow 00:39:40.120$ Well, we have a working hypothesis
- $00:39:40.120 \rightarrow 00:39:43.260$ for a possibility is definitely needed, all right?
- $00:39:43.260 \rightarrow 00:39:44.980$ And here it is.
- $00:39:44.980 \rightarrow 00:39:47.875$ If you look at all the different compounds,
- $00:39:47.875 \rightarrow 00:39:51.263$ and if the compound has a lot of nitrogen in it,
- $00:39:52.910 \rightarrow 00:39:56.830$ it seems to be selected against, whereas to copherol
- $00{:}39{:}56{.}830$ --> $00{:}40{:}00{.}670$ which has no nitrogen actually showed a slight increase
- $00{:}40{:}00{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}02{.}500$ as carbon dioxide went up.
- $00:40:02.500 \rightarrow 00:40:04.823$ The more nitrogen the compound had,
- $00:40:04.823 \rightarrow 00:40:07.590$ and this is just a ratio of the molecular weight,
- 00:40:07.590 --> 00:40:11.130 So vitamin B9 has, 20% of the provided
- $00:40:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.483$ vitamin B9 is nitrogen.
- $00:40:13.490 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.803$ So it follows along pretty good curve.
- 00:40:16.780 --> 00:40:19.873 So perking back to artemisinin.
- 00:40:21.110 --> 00:40:22.900 Artemisinin have no nitrogen in it,
- $00{:}40{:}22{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}25{.}683$ it went up with more carbon dioxide.
- $00:40:26.570 \rightarrow 00:40:30.230$ So now we have eight points or nine points.
- $00{:}40{:}30{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}31{.}200$ We're still trying to figure out.

 $00:40:31.200 \rightarrow 00:40:32.710$ Is this real or not?

 $00:40:32.710 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.240$ We have some recent information

 $00:40:35.240 \rightarrow 00:40:37.490$ for coffee, more coffee produces caffeine.

00:40:37.490 --> 00:40:39.090 Caffeine is a bicyclic alkaloid

 $00:40:39.090 \rightarrow 00:40:41.310$ with a lot of nitrogen, right?

 $00:40:41.310 \rightarrow 00:40:44.640$ So we have some initial information suggesting

 $00:40:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.200$ that caffeine is going down.

00:40:47.200 --> 00:40:49.100 I know that's disappointing, right?

00:40:49.100 --> 00:40:50.830 Trust me when I tell you I was very disappointed,

00:40:50.830 --> 00:40:53.290 I couldn't have gone through grad school without it.

 $00:40:53.290 \rightarrow 00:40:55.880$ But it's something to keep in mind.

 $00{:}40{:}55{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}58{.}280$ And but having said that, there was also variation

 $00{:}40{:}58{.}280$ --> $00{:}41{:}01{.}373$ among the different arabica lines that we looked at.

 $00{:}41{:}02{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07{.}520$ All right, we tried to take all this information and say,

00:41:07.520 --> 00:41:09.970 how does it affect different countries?

 $00:41:09.970 \rightarrow 00:41:13.950$ And we looked at it from the point of view of,

 $00:41:13.950 \rightarrow 00:41:15.840$ depending on the economics of the country,

 $00{:}41{:}15{.}840$ --> $00{:}41{:}19{.}700$ if I'm a very poor country, I tend to consume a lot of rice.

00:41:19.700 --> 00:41:23.970 For example, as China has become, as the economic status

 $00:41:23.970 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.040$ of the Chinese has increased,

 $00:41:26.040 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.647$ then the less rice is being consumed

 $00:41:27.647 \rightarrow 00:41:30.060$ and a more diverse diet is happening.

 $00:41:30.060 \rightarrow 00:41:32.420$ So there are usually out of the Chinese I think,

 $00:41:32.420 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.427$ are the green lines here.

 $00:41:33.427 \rightarrow 00:41:36.030$ But we looked at a number of different countries.

 $00:41:36.030 \rightarrow 00:41:39.703$ And basically, the poorer the country,

 $00{:}41{:}40{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}42{.}870$ the greater the deficit for the different

00:41:43.950 --> 00:41:47.920 actually trying not to confuse myself anymore.

 $00:41:47.920 \rightarrow 00:41:50.240$ But basically, the poorer the country,

 $00{:}41{:}50{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}54{.}510$ the greater the effect in terms of CO2 impacting nutritional

 $00:41:54.510 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.510$ value of the rice that's being consumed.

 $00:41:57.700 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.290$ And then we're trying to look at

 $00:41:59.290 \rightarrow 00:42:01.810$ the 10 poorest countries in the world.

 $00:42:01.810 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.460$ They're mostly agrarian.

 $00:42:03.460 \rightarrow 00:42:06.080$ This was the food production in metric tons,

 $00:42:06.080 \rightarrow 00:42:07.373$ million metric tons.

 $00:42:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.090$ This is the population here.

 $00:42:11.090 \rightarrow 00:42:13.100$ And then you can see food production relative

 $00:42:13.100 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.873$ to population is declining.

 $00:42:17.090 \rightarrow 00:42:19.523$ This is the kilograms per person per year.

 $00:42:20.880 \longrightarrow 00:42:22.850$ And we're trying to also look at

 $00{:}42{:}22.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}25.460$ the elevated CO2 effect on protein.

 $00:42:25.460 \rightarrow 00:42:27.720$ This is some work I'm doing with the broccoli,

 $00:42:27.720 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.800$ where he spent a sort of a an estimate

 $00{:}42{:}30{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}34{.}390$ on the effect in terms of protein for these other staples,

 $00:42:34.390 \rightarrow 00:42:37.610$ some of the staples are, that are dominant in these $00:42:37.610 \rightarrow 00:42:40.120$ countries to solve the maize, potatoes, rice, sorghum

 $00:42:40.120 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.020$ or sweet potatoes, but again...

 $00{:}42{:}43.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}46.750$ First, sorghum used to try much but there's a lot of

 $00:42:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.860$ decline in terms of protein concentration

 $00:42:48.860 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.423$ for these products.

 $00{:}42{:}52.610$ --> $00{:}42{:}54.800$ What else could be changing what's happening to the item,

00:42:54.800 --> 00:42:57.300 of course countries we don't really know for sure.

00:42:58.300 --> 00:43:00.380 Alright, so I didn't really get a chance to go into

 $00:43:00.380 \rightarrow 00:43:02.960$ all of the things in part because there's just not, $00:43:02.960 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.780$ a lot of information out there to go into. $00:43:05.780 \rightarrow 00:43:08.610$ But just looking at one, the nutritional aspect, $00:43:08.610 \rightarrow 00:43:11.700$ you get a sense like Oh, of just how fundamental $00:43:11.700 \rightarrow 00:43:15.900$ an aspect this is and how important it can be. $00:43:15.900 \rightarrow 00:43:18.577$ So plants interact by multiple means in $00:43:18.577 \rightarrow 00:43:21.750$ the health of our quality, the medicine and nutrition. $00:43:21.750 \rightarrow 00:43:24.450$ and maybe more than just people plants with this life. 00:43:25.295 --> 00:43:26.490 How is it going to affect in terms $00:43:26.490 \rightarrow 00:43:27.790$ of having a global impact? $00:43:29.579 \rightarrow 00:43:31.590$ A lot of questions to be addressed. $00:43:31.590 \rightarrow 00:43:33.863$ But here's the thing to keep in mind. $00:43:35.090 \rightarrow 00:43:36.600$ If you look at it from the point 00:43:36.600 --> 00:43:38.860 of view of animals and plants, $00:43:38.860 \rightarrow 00:43:41.240$ and you weigh all the animals weigh all the plants $00:43:41.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.673$ in terms of their biomass. $00:43:43.830 \rightarrow 00:43:46.563$ All animals are shown here. 00:43:47.700 - 00:43:49.293 They weigh about two gigatons. 00:43:50.605 --> 00:43:53.033 Plants constitute about two gigatons of carbon. $00:43:56.420 \rightarrow 00:43:58.360$ All the rest is plants and $00:43:58.360 \rightarrow 00:44:01.173$ they constitute 450 gigatons of carbon. 00:44:02.210 --> 00:44:05.700 If I affect plants, I'm going to affect $00:44:05.700 \rightarrow 00:44:07.890$ every living thing on earth. $00:44:07.890 \rightarrow 00:44:12.220$ And yet the CO2 as plant food mean dominates our thinking. $00:44:12.220 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.867$ It's much more than that. $00:44:16.000 \rightarrow 00:44:17.300$ What are the consequences? $00:44:21.600 \rightarrow 00:44:22.850$ Where do we go from here? $00:44:24.020 \rightarrow 00:44:27.710$ Well, we acknowledge that there's interaction, $00:44:27.710 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.940$ that carbon dioxide also needs to be looked at.

 $00:44:30.940 \rightarrow 00:44:33.010$ We acknowledge that the potential research

 $00:44:33.010 \rightarrow 00:44:36.050$ in the context of public health is enormous.

 $00{:}44{:}36{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}38{.}700$ There's so much more that we can be doing with this.

00:44:38.700 --> 00:44:41.773 What can we do to work together?

 $00{:}44{:}45{.}285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}47{.}700$ What can we do, what can we do as a means

00:44:47.700 --> 00:44:51.744 to find new opportunities,

 $00:44:51.744 \rightarrow 00:44:56.360$ new ways that we can come together to try

 $00{:}44{:}56{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}00{.}370$ and find new research to do on this area

 $00:45:00.370 \rightarrow 00:45:03.117$ that we haven't been able to find yet.

 $00{:}45{:}03.117$ --> $00{:}45{:}08.117$ And I'm hoping that at some point, this will come to pass.

 $00:45:08.527 \rightarrow 00:45:10.068$ So thank you all very much for your time.

 $00:45:10.068 \rightarrow 00:45:13.068$ (students clapping)

00:45:15.081 --> 00:45:17.215 - [Kai] So now is the question time and

00:45:17.215 --> 00:45:21.548 if you have a question, just raise your hand ask it.

00:45:22.787 --> 00:45:25.287 - [Lewis] I know it's a lot of information people. 00:45:26.250 --> 00:45:27.428 Yes.

00:45:27.428 --> 00:45:28.817 - [Student] I just wondered if any...

00:45:28.817 --> 00:45:32.280 You know, you said that to copherol might not go down

 $00{:}45{:}32{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}35{.}550$ because it's not, in a way, it doesn't contain nitrogen.

 $00{:}45{:}35{.}550$ --> $00{:}45{:}39{.}840$ So how's that experiment you've done when on (mumbles)

00:45:39.840 --> 00:45:41.363 available - [Lewis] Yeah this is one of

 $00:45:41.363 \rightarrow 00:45:43.633$ the things that occurred to us initially was that

 $00{:}45{:}43.633$ --> $00{:}45{:}46.130$ what we're seeing is because of stimulation of growth,

 $00:45:46.130 \rightarrow 00:45:48.920$ and there's a position (mumbles) of nitrogen.

 $00:45:48.920 \rightarrow 00:45:51.737$ So to counter that we made sure that

 $00{:}45{:}52{.}815$ --> $00{:}45{:}55{.}500$ we had the chamber experiment where we could really vary

 $00{:}45{:}55{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}58{.}215$ the amount of nitrogen but also ensure

 $00:45:58.215 \rightarrow 00:45:59.520$ that we're getting super amounts of nitrogen

 $00:45:59.520 \rightarrow 00:46:01.607$ something like and is one of (mumbles).

00:46:06.746 --> 00:46:07.640 - [Student] Great work - [Lewis] Yes.

 $00:46:07.640 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.090$ I'm sorry.

00:46:09.090 --> 00:46:11.147 - [Student] No, that's great work.

00:46:11.147 --> 00:46:11.980 - [Male Student] Have people looked at

00:46:11.980 --> 00:46:14.100 sea grasses and aquatic plants?

00:46:14.100 --> 00:46:16.460 - [Lewis] No, not to my knowledge.

 $00:46:16.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.127$ Not to my knowledge.

 $00:46:19.750 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.378$ Yes.

00:46:21.378 --> 00:46:25.431 - [Student] So, as you mentioned in your view,

 $00{:}46{:}25{.}431 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}30{.}098$ the cost is highly variable costs probably 10 hours ago.

 $00:46:31.147 \rightarrow 00:46:33.003$ They are paid by the common practices,

 $00:46:33.003 \rightarrow 00:46:37.130$ so, I guess that by, to what extent or stage

00:46:37.130 --> 00:46:41.460 is impact of climate change will have observance of

 $00:46:42.657 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.280$ human health outcome and also

 $00:46:47.370 \rightarrow 00:46:51.573$ using all this technology of reading,

 $00{:}46{:}52{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56{.}610$ nutritious varieties and also different farming practices

 $00{:}46{:}56{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}58{.}370$ and also intensification to

 $00:47:01.060 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.340$ increase productivity as a

 $00:47:06.253 \rightarrow 00:47:10.384$ to what, kind of, what can you say all these tests

 $00{:}47{:}10{.}384$ --> $00{:}47{:}13{.}250$ can help us to (murmurs) and damage to the plants?

 $00:47:13.250 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.220$ - [Lewis] There's a lot in there.

 $00{:}47{:}15{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}17{.}287$ So let me try and actually to address

 $00{:}47{:}17.287 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}20.000$ that particular number entire somehow.

00:47:20.000 --> 00:47:22.700 But let me try and address it quickly.

 $00{:}47{:}22.700$ --> $00{:}47{:}24.905$ One of the things that we're currently doing and nutrition

 $00:47:24.905 \rightarrow 00:47:26.160$ is currently doing justification,

 $00:47:26.160 \rightarrow 00:47:28.720$ we're using what are called monocultures.

 $00{:}47{:}28.720$ --> $00{:}47{:}32.050$ The genetics of the crop that you're growing all the same.

00:47:32.050 --> 00:47:35.360 So as you get rid of small landowners,

 $00:47:35.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.180$ which have more diverse genetics, and you go

 $00:47:38.180 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.743$ to bigger and bigger fields,

 $00:47:40.760 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.143$ there are different reasons for it

 $00{:}47{:}42.143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}45.500$ that it becomes more and more uniform, has to be.

 $00{:}47{:}45{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48{.}020$ The problem with becoming more uniform, you don't have

 $00:47:48.020 \rightarrow 00:47:53.020$ a diversity necessary in order to find the lines

 $00:47:53.570 \rightarrow 00:47:56.870$ that are you could say different to their effects

 $00:47:56.870 \longrightarrow 00:47:58.670$ and CO2 and with respect to protein.

00:48:00.398 --> 00:48:02.490 That's part of our job or it was part of our job

 $00:48:02.490 \rightarrow 00:48:04.990$ when I was with USDA is to begin to look at these $00:48:04.990 \rightarrow 00:48:08.483$ different lines and to look at how they might respond.

 $00{:}48{:}09{.}710$ --> $00{:}48{:}12{.}250$ Part of it is management and began there are different

 $00:48:12.250 \rightarrow 00:48:15.570$ aspects of that as well, because of rising water

 $00{:}48{:}15.570$ --> $00{:}48{:}18.270$ product prices and water consumption.

 $00{:}48{:}18{.}270$ --> $00{:}48{:}21{.}113$ Flooded rice is not as grown as much as it used to be.

 $00{:}48{:}22.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}24.310$ And it has a whole nother suite of consequences that

00:48:24.310 --> 00:48:26.280 I unfortunately don't have time to, we could talk more

00:48:26.280 --> 00:48:29.270 about it after class if you wanna know more.

 $00:48:29.270 \rightarrow 00:48:32.000$ What we are currently doing in terms of breeding

 $00{:}48{:}32.000$ --> $00{:}48{:}37.000$ is we we're seeing two dissimilar breeding attempts.

 $00{:}48{:}37{.}710$ --> $00{:}48{:}40{.}610$ We have farmers and breeders who are breeding for yield

 $00{:}48{:}40.610$ --> $00{:}48{:}44.600$ and breeding for taste and breeding for insect resistance.

 $00{:}48{:}44{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}47{.}920$ And as CO2 is going up in nature, we think that in

 $00:48:47.920 \rightarrow 00:48:50.230$ itself is having a selection effect.

 $00:48:50.230 \rightarrow 00:48:54.470$ So for example, we see wild rice, weeded rice,

 $00:48:54.470 \rightarrow 00:48:57.010$ is showing a much stronger response to the change,

 $00:48:57.010 \rightarrow 00:49:00.540$ recent changes in CO2 and cultivated absence.

 $00{:}49{:}00{.}540$ --> $00{:}49{:}02{.}860$ And they're actually putting more of that additional

 $00{:}49{:}02{.}860$ --> $00{:}49{:}06{.}590$ carbon dioxide into seedling for the weeded rice.

 $00{:}49{:}06{.}590$ --> $00{:}49{:}11{.}100$ So we think that there's an opportunity here as well.

 $00{:}49{:}11{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}14{.}070$ And that is to look at the weeded rice as a means to begin

 $00:49:14.070 \rightarrow 00:49:17.990$ to adapt to, for the cultivated rice to adapt,

 $00:49:17.990 \rightarrow 00:49:21.700$ and to look at the both technology and genetics

 $00{:}49{:}21.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}26.300$ of the weeded rice as a means to begin to bring or

 $00{:}49{:}26{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}29{.}680$ to adapt cultivated rice, so that it can not only respond

 $00:49:29.680 \rightarrow 00:49:32.563$ to warm climate, but actually might benefit by it.

00:49:33.450 --> 00:49:35.723 Okay, anybody have a cell phone?

00:49:37.570 - 00:49:40.150 Would you google something for me?

 $00:49:40.150 \rightarrow 00:49:42.393$ This isn't about... is that okay?

 $00:49:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.263$ Okay.

 $00:49:45.601 \rightarrow 00:49:48.813$ Would you google to something for me?

 $00{:}49{:}48{.}813$ --> $00{:}49{:}52.010$ Would you, and this is not about rice, but just for fun,

 $00:49:52.010 \rightarrow 00:49:55.450$ would you google carbon dioxide and marijuana

 $00:49:57.800 \rightarrow 00:50:01.557$ and tell me what the first sentence that you get.

 $00:50:13.682 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.099$ What does it say?

00:50:16.469 --> 00:50:18.836 - [Student] How do you use CO2 increase you

00:50:18.836 --> 00:50:19.700 - [Lewis] Can you say that louder?

00:50:19.700 --> 00:50:20.837 - [Student] Sure, how do you use CO2 to

00:50:20.837 --> 00:50:22.990 increase yields in your marijuana.

00:50:22.990 --> 00:50:24.640 - [Lewis] How do you do CO2 to increase yields

 $00:50:24.640 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.790$ in your marijuana crop?

 $00:50:27.900 \rightarrow 00:50:32.900$ So I'm guessing here that if they can do that

 $00{:}50{:}33{.}593$ --> $00{:}50{:}35{.}620$ and literally they have indoor chambers and they're doing

 $00:50:35.620 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.560$ it you know that way.

 $00{:}50{:}37{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}40{.}180$ But remember the CO2 has already gone up by 30%.

 $00{:}50{:}40{.}180$ --> $00{:}50{:}44{.}050$ Are we missing out on an opportunity by not taking

 $00:50:44.050 \rightarrow 00:50:46.410$ the increase that's already occurred and begin

 $00:50:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.015$ to find the best suited genotypes that can take

 $00:50:49.015 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.450$ that increase and divert them into seeds.

 $00:50:52.450 \rightarrow 00:50:55.260$ I can go online, I can do this in more depth,

00:50:55.260 --> 00:50:57.870 I can find out from the marijuana industry,

 $00:50:57.870 \rightarrow 00:51:00.670$ when to give the CO2, how much to give the CO2,

 $00:51:00.670 \rightarrow 00:51:02.460$ what the temperature is to give the CO2,

 $00{:}51{:}02{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}05{.}743$ what the hormone THC I can get from the CO2 will be.

 $00:51:07.130 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.630$ Why can't we do that for food?

 $00:51:10.170 \rightarrow 00:51:13.022$ I would argue there's an opportunity there.

00:51:13.022 --> 00:51:13.855 Anyway

 $00:51:15.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.310$ So...

 $00:51:17.310 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.260$ Yes.

00:51:18.260 --> 00:51:19.790 - [Student] How's it that when kind of follow the

 $00{:}51{:}19{.}790$ --> $00{:}51{:}23{.}520$ mass cyber, there isn't any much of a research into

 $00:51:24.480 \rightarrow 00:51:27.740$ trying to (mumbles) the decrease in vitamins

 $00:51:27.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.100$ and minerals in the plants and

 $00:51:29.100 \rightarrow 00:51:31.190$ to actual public health in the past?

00:51:31.190 --> 00:51:32.570 - [Lewis] No, and that's a good point.

 $00:51:32.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.083$ We haven't done that yet but,

 $00:51:36.083 \rightarrow 00:51:39.790$ that's one of the things we'd like to work on.

 $00:51:39.790 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.740$ We put in a convergence

 $00:51:43.740 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.707$ RFP for NSF to do that.

 $00{:}51{:}46{.}707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}47{.}860$ And they turned us down.

00:51:47.860 --> 00:51:49.663 So we, I know,

 $00:51:52.240 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.290$ we're still on track.

00:51:54.239 --> 00:51:55.360 I think it's important.

 $00:51:55.360 \rightarrow 00:51:56.193$ Yes.

00:51:56.193 --> 00:51:57.450 - [Student] Yeah, on that note, I mean,

00:51:57.450 --> 00:52:01.480 I couldn't help but wonder in your, during your presentation

 $00:52:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.480$ if the increase or if the alarming increase in

00:52:09.610 --> 00:52:14.433 malnourished, obese folks might have, you know, if

 $00{:}52{:}16{.}427 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}19{.}170$ I'm sorry, can't talk to the, I just gave up coffee

00:52:19.170 --> 00:52:20.110 - [Lewis] Oh, am sorry.

 $00:52:20.110 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.360$ (laughing)

 $00{:}52{:}24{.}134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}28{.}650$ - [Student] You spoke about plants being carbon rich

00:52:28.650 --> 00:52:31.050 and vitamin poor, now right?

 $00:52:31.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.320$ And so I can't help but wonder if

 $00:52:34.320 \rightarrow 00:52:38.450$ that could potentially be some contributing factor

 $00{:}52{:}38{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}41{.}640$ to this concurrent prevalence

 $00:52:41.640 \rightarrow 00:52:44.823$ of obesity alongside malnutrition.

00:52:44.823 --> 00:52:46.893 - [Lewis] We don't know, we think it could be,

 $00{:}52{:}46{.}893 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}50{.}274$ certainly logically interpreted there's...

 $00{:}52{:}50{.}274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}52{.}000$ it could be, but we'd like to be able to get

 $00:52:52.000 \longrightarrow 00:52:53.380$ the numbers just to show it.

00:52:53.380 --> 00:52:54.230 - [Student] Sure.

00:52:55.150 --> 00:52:57.535 - [Lewis] So unfortunately, that at the moment,

 $00:52:57.535 \rightarrow 00:53:02.493$ it's the Chinese folks, we just have to ignore it.

00:53:02.493 --> 00:53:05.090 - [Student] I also had another thought and maybe it's

 $00:53:05.090 \rightarrow 00:53:06.420$ for everyone in the room,

00:53:06.420 --> 00:53:08.760 just from a public health stand-point,

 $00{:}53{:}08{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}09{.}800$ you know, are the re...

 $00:53:09.800 \rightarrow 00:53:13.830$ do we know of any large ongoing sources of data

00:53:13.830 --> 00:53:18.830 that actually, that ask about allergy, food allergy

 $00:53:19.390 \longrightarrow 00:53:21.000$ or environmental allergy?

 $00:53:21.000 \rightarrow 00:53:23.760$ But this isn't my area of research,

 $00:53:23.760 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.327$ but does anyone know of any?

 $00:53:27.000 \rightarrow 00:53:30.060 - I$ don't imagine that there are databases

 $00:53:30.060 \rightarrow 00:53:33.837$ for food allergies that are available.

 $00:53:33.837 \rightarrow 00:53:35.537$ I don't know how far back they go.

 $00{:}53{:}37{.}885 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40{.}920$ And it would be difficult thing given the other issue

 $00{:}53{:}40{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}45{.}240$ in epidemiology is early exposure, and other aspects

 $00{:}53{:}45{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}47{.}420$ that make it difficult to try and assess with

 $00{:}53{:}47{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}49{.}863$ a separate role of climate of carbon dioxide.

 $00:53:51.170 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.220$ But it's a good idea.

 $00{:}53{:}53{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}56{.}603$ We did, I didn't mention this, but we did a study on peanut,

 $00:53:58.300 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.570$ we have two different varieties of peanut

 $00{:}54{:}00{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}03{.}331$ which we grew at different carbon dioxide concentrations,

 $00{:}54{:}03{.}331 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}07{.}880$ and over a two year period, and one of the varieties

 $00{:}54{:}07{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}11{.}105$ for both years showed an increase in Arachis stage one.

 $00:54:11.105 \rightarrow 00:54:14.277$ Arachis is peanut genus that's also the name

 $00:54:14.277 \rightarrow 00:54:17.450$ of the primary allergen that peanuts produce.

 $00:54:17.450 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.427$ It's about a 10% increase in the allergen,

 $00:54:18.427 \rightarrow 00:54:20.973$ but the other one didn't do anything.

 $00:54:21.940 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.719$ So it needs more work.

 $00:54:23.719 \rightarrow 00:54:27.273$ We need to find out why is this line responding

 $00:54:27.273 \rightarrow 00:54:28.898$ the other line not responding.

00:54:28.898 --> 00:54:30.723 What's going on?

 $00{:}54{:}30{.}723 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}31{.}793$ We just don't know.

 $00:54:34.360 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.200$ Yes.

00:54:35.200 --> 00:54:36.878 - [Student] I have kind an answer to your question.

00:54:36.878 --> 00:54:39.950 I mean, those collect technology

 $00:54:40.920 \rightarrow 00:54:44.340$ so they have some (mumbles) from 2007, 2010.

 $00{:}54{:}47{.}478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}51{.}162$ Probably just some recorded geology.

 $00:54:51.162 \rightarrow 00:54:53.781$ And it looks like they have problem (mumbling)

 $00:54:53.781 \longrightarrow 00:54:54.840$ the categories so...

 $00:54:54.840 \rightarrow 00:54:56.940$ - [Female Student] Oh, awesome, thank you.

00:54:58.948 --> 00:55:01.408 - [Lewis] Okay, yes, last question.

00:55:01.408 --> 00:55:04.797 - [Male Student] That is (mumbling) though is that

 $00:55:07.399 \rightarrow 00:55:11.611$ the total climate change mitigation challenges

 $00:55:11.611 \rightarrow 00:55:13.887$ that mattered, is there any one focusing on

 $00:55:13.887 \rightarrow 00:55:17.600$ the technology challenges (mumbles)?

00:55:17.600 --> 00:55:20.380 - [Lewis] There are a number of things, for means better

 $00{:}55{:}20{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}25{.}380$ at the management level, but also at the genetics level

 $00:55:25.690 \rightarrow 00:55:27.620$ and at the consumer level and we think,

 $00:55:27.620 \rightarrow 00:55:31.920$ within the food system are ways to reduce

 $00{:}55{:}31{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}33{.}670$ greenhouse gas emissions.

 $00{:}55{:}33.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}38.670$ So for example, one of the things that USDA was working on

00:55:38.930 --> 00:55:40.350 before I left was

 $00:55:41.310 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.143$ was called

 $00:55:44.270 \rightarrow 00:55:47.210$ water deficit irrigation with rice.

00:55:47.210 --> 00:55:50.370 Typically, rice is flooded because

 $00:55:50.370 \longrightarrow 00:55:52.083$ it's a way of keeping weeds down.

 $00{:}55{:}53{.}140$ --> $00{:}55{:}57{.}310$ And, but flooding rice also produces a lot of methane.

 $00{:}55{:}57{.}310$ --> $00{:}55{:}59{.}560$ And so if you change the management, you can reduce

 $00:55:59.560 \rightarrow 00:56:01.350$ the amount of methane that's being produced.

 $00{:}56{:}01{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}03{.}950$ But farmers are worried and of course,

 $00{:}56{:}03.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}05.360$ they do that, that's going to reduce

 $00:56:05.360 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.540$ the bottom line of production.

 $00:56:07.540 \rightarrow 00:56:10.270$ So USDA was doing studies trying to look

 $00{:}56{:}10.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}14.090$ at alternative drawing and say that they did management plan

 $00:56:14.940 \rightarrow 00:56:17.420$ as a means to see if it would reduce methane.

 $00:56:17.420 \rightarrow 00:56:19.760$ Because you can't wag your finger at a farmer

 $00:56:19.760 \rightarrow 00:56:21.940$ and say you're producing too much methane.

00:56:21.940 --> 00:56:23.277 But you can go up to them and say, "Hey, you know

00:56:23.277 --> 00:56:25.757 "I've go this great idea that's gonna increase your yields,

 $00{:}56{:}25{.}757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}27{.}887$ "but also reduce your cost for water,

00:56:27.887 --> 00:56:28.993 "oh by the way, it's gonna reduce the methane,

00:56:28.993 --> 00:56:30.043 "but you don't care."

 $00:56:31.540 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.690$ And just go, go with that.

 $00{:}56{:}33{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35{.}190$ There's lots of opportunities.

 $00{:}56{:}36{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}40{.}250$ What if you were a pure consumer, and you're at the market,

 $00:56:40.250 \rightarrow 00:56:42.863$ and you're looking at buying a package of beef,

 $00:56:43.800 \rightarrow 00:56:45.830$ what if the information was there,

 $00:56:45.830 \rightarrow 00:56:48.560$ it says how much of my greenhouse gas feature

 $00:56:48.560 \rightarrow 00:56:51.160$ for buying this kind of be for us?

00:56:51.160 --> 00:56:53.820 Yeah, you know, I could compare it to different brands

00:56:53.820 --> 00:56:56.043 to see, okay, well, I've got three different brands

 $00{:}56{:}56{.}043 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}58{.}750$ of beef here, but hey, this one's producing much less

 $00{:}56{:}58{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01{.}050$ greenhouse gas, maybe I should buy this brand.

 $00:57:02.330 \rightarrow 00:57:06.300$ So yeah, there's lots of really cool, interesting,

 $00{:}57{:}06{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07{.}940$ fun things to look at.

00:57:07.940 --> 00:57:10.260 I mean, it's just, it's a question

 $00:57:10.260 \rightarrow 00:57:11.910$ of having the resources to do it.

00:57:14.550 --> 00:57:17.033 - [Kai] Okay, thank you for this kind,

 $00:57:17.960 \dashrightarrow 00:57:21.050$ I think it was an excellent lecture.

 $00{:}57{:}21.050$ --> $00{:}57{:}26.030$ Although we have a few, many but all of us have an interest.