

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR:"S. Fred Singer" <singer@sepp.org> ( "S. Fred Singer" <singer@sepp.org> [ UN

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUN-2003 09:14:46.00

SUBJECT:: Fwd: Report by the E.P.A. Leaves Out Data on Climate Change

TO:rlindzen@mit.edu ( rlindzen@mit.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC:mebell@cei.org ( mebell@cei.org [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC:wsoon@cfa.harvard.edu ( wsoon@cfa.harvard.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC:Kenneth L. Peel ( CN=Kenneth L. Peel/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [ CEQ ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC:flsmith@cei.org ( flsmith@cei.org [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Dick

Tx for yr talk yesterday.

I understand yr pessimism but that's because you live in Cambridge in the People's Republic of Mass.y I on the other hand read the Wash Times every morning and talk to my friends at CEI, Cato and all the other Cooler Heads.y It does affect one's outlook.

And -- collectively -y we are getting through.y See attached and note the consternation.

Hope you enjoy the spoof on the NYT that I sent you yesterday

Bestyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyy Fred

PSy I attach my think piece for Mahoney on climate models.yyy I have now had a chance to study and compare the strengths and weaknesses of the NCAR, GISS, and GFDL models.

\*\*\*\*\*

To: deckerfw@juno.com, joseph-h@dgweb.com, singer@sepp.org, yy chos@mindspring.com, veeking@earthlink.com

Date: Thu, 19 Jun 2003 00:51:53 -0700

Subject: Report by the E.P.A. Leaves Out Data on Climate Change

X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.33

From: Laurence D Mendenhall <ldmendenhall@juno.com>

X-pstn-levels:yyy (C:83.1967 P:95.9108 R:95.9108 S:59.3911 )

X-pstn-settings: 4 (1.5000:4.5000) pmCr

X-pstn-addresses: from <ldmendenhall@juno.com>

This looks like a positive development.y But of course the NYT puts it in a negative light.y Note especially the third paragraph from the end.y Someone must be getting through to the White House!

y

Larry

Y

June 19, 2003

Report by the E.P.A. Leaves Out Data on Climate Change

By ANDREW C. REVKIN with KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

18fde7a5.jpghe Environmental Protection Agency is preparing to publish a draft report next week on the state of the environment, but after editing by the White House, a long section describing risks from rising global temperatures has been whittled to a few noncommittal paragraphs.

The report, commissioned in 2001 by the agency's administrator, Christie Whitman, was intended to provide the first comprehensive review of what is known about various environmental problems, where gaps in understanding exist and how to fill them.

Agency officials said it was tentatively scheduled to be released early next week, before Mrs. Whitman steps down on June 27, ending a troubled time in office that often put her at odds with President Bush.

Drafts of the climate section, with changes sought by the White House, were given to The New York Times yesterday by a former E.P.A. official, along with earlier drafts and an internal memorandum in which some officials protested the changes. Two agency officials, speaking on the condition of anonymity, said the documents were authentic.

The editing eliminated references to many studies concluding that warming is at least partly caused by rising concentrations of smokestack and tail-pipe emissions and could threaten health and ecosystems.

Among the deletions were conclusions about the likely human contribution to warming from a 2001 report on climate by the National Research Council that the White House had commissioned and that President Bush had endorsed in speeches that year. White House officials also deleted a reference to a 1999 study showing that global temperatures had risen sharply in the previous decade compared with the last 1,000 years. In its place, administration officials added a reference to a new study, partly financed by the American Petroleum Institute, questioning that conclusion.

In the end, E.P.A. staff members, after discussions with administration officials, said they decided to delete the entire discussion to avoid criticism that they were selectively filtering science to suit policy.

Administration officials defended the report and said there was nothing untoward about the process that produced it. Mrs. Whitman said that she was "perfectly comfortable" with the edited version and that the differences over climate change should not hold up the broader assessment of the nation's air, land and water.

"The first draft, as with many first drafts, contained everything," she said in a brief telephone interview from the CBS studios in Manhattan, where she was waiting to tape "The Late Show With David Letterman."

"As it went through the review, there was less consensus on the science and conclusions on climate change," Ms. Whitman said. "So rather than go out with something half-baked or not put out the whole report, we felt it was important for us to get this out because there is a lot of really good information that people can use to measure our successes."

James L. Connaughton, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, a White House advisory group, said, "It would be utterly inaccurate to suggest that this administration has not provided quite an extensive discussion about the state of the climate. Ultimately, E.P.A. made the decision not to include the section on climate change because we had these ample discussions of the subject already."

But private environmental groups sharply criticized the changes when they heard of them.

"Political staff are becoming increasingly bold in forcing agency officials to endorse junk science," said Jeremy Symons, a climate policy expert at the National Wildlife Federation. "This is like the White House directing the secretary of labor to alter unemployment data to paint a rosy economic picture."

Drafts of the report have been circulating for months, but a heavy round of rewriting and cutting by White House officials in late April raised protest among E.P.A. officials working on the report.

An April 29 memorandum circulated among staff members said that after the changes by White House officials, the section on climate "no longer accurately represents scientific consensus on climate change."

Another memorandum circulated at the same time said that the easiest course would be to accept the White House revisions but that to do so would taint the agency, because "E.P.A. will take responsibility and severe criticism from the science and environmental communities for poorly representing the science."

The changes were mainly made by the Council on Environmental Quality, although the Office of Management and Budget was also involved, several E.P.A. officials said. It is the second time in a year that the White House has sought to play down global warming in official documents.

Last September, an annual E.P.A. report on air pollution that for six years had contained a section on climate was released without one, and the decision to delete it was made by Bush administration appointees at the agency with White House approval.

Like the September report, the forthcoming report says the issues will be dealt with later by a climate research plan being prepared by the Bush administration.

Other sections of the coming E.P.A. report □\* on water quality, ecological conditions, ozone depletion in the atmosphere and other issues □\* all start with a summary statement about the potential impact of changes on human health and the environment, which are the two responsibilities of the agency.

But in the "Global Issues" section of the draft returned by the White House to E.P.A. in April, an introductory sentence reading, "Climate change has global consequences for human health and the environment" was



## Research with Climate Models—3 Tasks

SFS/6/3/03

In pursuing the goals of the CCSP, the climate modeling community should undertake three important and distinct research tasks – listed here according to priority.

### **1. Validation of climate models against observations:**

The most important task is the validation of models by comparing their results with observations, primarily with temperatures of the past ~50 years (where good data are available) but also with precipitation, changes in ocean currents, and perhaps other climate parameters.

For this purpose, a model must simulate the various forcings as accurately as possible, incl. their spatial and temporal dependence. In addition to GH gases, this would include the direct and indirect effects of different classes of aerosols (both natural and manmade), stratospheric and tropospheric ozone, and variability of solar irradiance and solar wind effects. Changes in land use and possibly growing air traffic can also influence climate trends. The time resolution for specifying forcings should be at least a month and should include day-night effects, where appropriate, with a resolution of one hour.

The model results should be the temperature fields and trends at different atmospheric levels (from surface to stratosphere) with a time resolution of 1-3 months and at least zonal spatial resolution. In addition, one would like to explore any trends in seasonal ratios and in the diurnal temperature range (DTR).

In reviewing the history of climate modeling, e.g., in the three major IPCC reports, one sees increasing sophistication and attempts to simulate important climate forcings. Starting with only GH gases a decade ago, models have gradually added the interaction with ocean circulation, the direct effects of sulfate aerosol, then ozone changes, and finally volcanic events and solar irradiance changes. But current research points to important forcings (like black carbon) that have not as yet been included in standard models. So there has been remarkable progress – and we may yet discover other forcings and feedbacks that must be included.

It is remarkable that every IPCC Summary has claimed that observed temperature trends are in agreement with model results and that the “climate sensitivity” (the temperature increase corresponding to a doubling of GH gas forcing) is between 1.5 and 4.5 C. Actually, slight changes in cloud parameters (like droplet-size distribution) can yield even higher (or lower) values. We believe that the temperature record of the past 50 years is dominated by non-GH forcings and that climate sensitivity is less than 1.5C, and perhaps much less – in which case future temperature increases will be inconsequential.

[The claimed validation presented in the IPCC-TAR Summary is unacceptable because it

shows only 1) annual global mean temperature, 2) surface values, and 3) a limited number of forcings (e.g., no Black Carbon, no indirect effects, no effects of solar wind). It gains little by reaching back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, since forcings are poorly known and temperature data are quite incomplete.]

## **2. Predicting the climate of 2100 and beyond:**

For this purpose, the steady increase in GH gas concentration should eventually overcome other forcings, like short-lived aerosols and the more or less periodic variations of ozone and of solar activity.

Here the important task is to intercompare model results using only GH gas forcing according to some agreed-to standard scenario. The purpose is not to predict a future warming but to discover how model results depend on various parameterizations (e. g., of clouds) and other assumptions incorporated into particular models.

One measure of success would be the narrowing of the existing dispersion in climate sensitivity results. The most important task –involving considerable research efforts – will be to simulate successfully the important feedbacks of the atmosphere-ocean-land-cryosphere system. In particular, one needs to establish the feedbacks, both positive and negative, of clouds (from stratus to cirrus) and of upper-tropospheric water vapor.

## **3. Studying natural climate variability:**

It is often claimed that a long-duration model run without any change in forcing can give a realistic value of natural climate variability (“noise”). A priori, this seems doubtful, and this doubt is reinforced by the fact that different models give different results for “natural variability.” It would be interesting to establish the causes for these differences among models, esp. for coupled atmosphere-ocean models.

### **In Summary:**

We visualize three distinct types of model studies. The first, a comparison with observations, using all of the relevant forcings. The second, an Intercomparison between models, using only GH gas forcing, over a 100-year period. The third is an Intercomparison of long runs (>500 years) of unforced models to study internal variability.

\*\*\*\*\*