

What is the consensus opinion among climate scientists about the impact of Trump's policies regarding climate on the lives of Americans over the next one hundred years?

ChatGPT said:

Here's the short version of what mainstream climate science says and how it maps onto Trump-era (and current) climate policies:

□ **What climate scientists broadly agree on**

The IPCC (the world's scientific consensus body) and the U.S. Fifth National Climate Assessment (NCA5) conclude that, absent strong cuts to heat-trapping pollution, Americans face worsening heat waves and air-quality episodes; rising coastal flood risk from accelerating sea-level rise; more costly extremes (heavy rain, drought, fire weather); declining labor productivity and outdoor worker safety; growing health burdens (especially for children, the elderly, and low-income communities); and mounting economic damages through the century. These assessments synthesize thousands of peer-reviewed studies and represent the core scientific consensus.

[IPCC+1NOAAEarth Information Center](#)

□ **What that means in numbers (illustrative, U.S.-relevant)**

- Heat & health: With high emissions, U.S. mortality rates are projected to be higher by century's end; federal analysts estimate roughly a 1.5–2.0% increase in mortality by 2100 under ~4 °C warming, with many more dangerous heat days. [Congressional Budget Office](#)

- Coasts: U.S. sea level is likely ~1 ft higher by 2050 and ~2.3–4 ft by 2100 (more if ice-sheet loss accelerates), sharply increasing chronic flooding in many communities.

[NOAAEarth Information Center](#)

- Work & economy: Without mitigation, lost labor hours and wages from heat rise steeply; earlier EPA syntheses estimate that mitigation avoids on the order of a billion lost work hours and ~\$100 B in wages per year by 2100. [US EPA](#)

□ **How Trump's climate/energy approach affects those risks (the scientific through-line)**

Climate risk scales with cumulative greenhouse-gas emissions. Policies that weaken or remove pollution limits, slow clean-energy build-out, or unwind efficiency standards increase U.S. emissions versus stronger-policy baselines, which in turn pushes outcomes toward the higher-risk end of the ranges above. Independent modeling of recent Trump-



era policy shifts (e.g., the “One Big Beautiful Bill” changes to clean-energy incentives and subsequent rulemakings) finds slower renewable deployment, higher energy costs, and higher emissions than under prior law—outcomes that, in the consensus scientific framing, translate to larger climate damages over the coming decades. [Rhodium Group+1Energy Innovation+1](#)

□ **Bottom line (consensus view applied to Trump’s policies)**

From the perspective of the IPCC and NCA5, a policy path that relaxes climate regulations and curtails clean-energy/efficiency programs increases long-term harm to Americans’ health, safety, infrastructure, and finances compared with a path that rapidly cuts emissions. The precise size of the added harm depends on how far policies go and how long they persist, but the direction is unambiguous in the scientific literature: higher emissions → higher heat-related illness and deaths, more costly coastal flooding, greater losses to labor and agriculture, and larger overall economic damages through 2100. [IPCC+1](#)

If you want, I can translate these findings to your city or county (heat days, flood risk, energy cost implications) using the same sources.

ChatGPT can make mistakes. Check important info.

