

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming

“The Administration’s View on the State of Climate Science”

December 2, 2009

10:00 am

B-318 Rayburn House Office Building

Witness Questions for the record

General Questions for both Dr. Holdren and Dr. Lubchenco

- 1) Given that EPA's Endangerment Finding is largely based on the IPCC's finding and those findings were based on data that is now subject to questions of scientific integrity, do you believe that EPA should have delayed its Endangerment Finding?
 - Should EPA regulate while significant questions of scientific integrity are outstanding?
- 2) On March 19 of this year, Ben Santer wrote that, "If the RMS is going to require authors to make ALL data available - raw data PLUS results from all intermediate calculations - I will not submit any further papers to RMS journals."
 - Do you believe that raw data supporting journal articles should be available? Isn't the availability of data an important element of transparency?
 - Would you support legislation that required journals publishing federally-funded research to make their raw data available to the public?
- 3) Do the newly released e-mails raise any concerns for you? Specifically, do they raise concerns about the integrity of the scientific process?
- 4) Notwithstanding your skepticism and dismissal of the contents of the released e-mails, they have raised a great deal of concern and questions by scientists, policymakers and American taxpayers.
 - Before proceeding with any climate change legislation in Congress that establishes a cap-and-tax system - which is widely acknowledged to have a drastic economic impact on the lives of Americans - would you support an independent and exhaustive investigation into the e-mails?
 - Who do you recommend conduct this investigation and why?

Questions for Dr. John Holdren, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and Director of OSTP

- 1) In an August 2006 interview with BBC News, you said that if the current pace of change continued, a catastrophic sea level rise of 4 meters (13 feet) was within the realm of possibility. However, the IPCC's 2007 report projects that sea level rise between now and 2100 will range between 7 and 23 inches.^[1]
 - Your projection of sea level rise was over 11 feet higher than even the worst case scenario projected by the IPCC. Do you now accept the IPCC's much lower projection?
 - If so, why do you think you were wrong? Are you at all concerned about misrepresentation of the state of the science with respect to global warming?
- 2) As science advisor to the Obama Administration, will you guarantee Congress that you will provide the public with access to all documents prepared with government funding relating to climate change?
- 3) Can you assure the Committee that you won't support claims by some scientists that research obtained with taxpayers' dollars on climate change is not subject to disclosure because the IPCC is an "international body"?
- 4) As the president's chief science advisor, will you support my efforts to make public all relevant data, codes and documentation regarding major temperature data at NASA and NOAA?
- 5) In an October 13, 2003 email, you defend Dr. Michael Mann's hockey stick theory and aggressively attack Dr. Willie Soon and Dr. Sallie Baliunas for questioning his work.
 - Do you stand by this criticism now that the "hockey stick theory" has been discredited?
 - Why did you so aggressively attack Drs. Soon and Baliunas?
 - Do you still support Dr. Mann in light of the recently disclosed emails, knowing of his efforts to hide his data and encourage his colleagues to shut out journals like Climate Research for publishing works contrary to his bias?
- 6) During the hearing, you testified that, "I would point out, for example, that the term 'trick' is often used in science to describe a clever way to get around a difficulty that is perfectly legitimate. The use of the word 'trick' does not, in itself, in science demonstrate that there was manipulation."
 - In the context of our discussion, the word 'trick' is not used by itself. It is in fact used to describe how Dr. Phil Jones added "in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years -- that is from 1981 onwards -- and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline." Please explain how the word 'trick' as used by Dr. Jones in this example, "does not, in itself, in science demonstrate that there was manipulation."

^[1] (References: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/5303574.stm>; http://www.iop.org/EJ/article/1748-9326/2/2/024002/er17_2_024002.html).

- Please provide examples of correspondence prior to November 1, 2009, by climate change scientists where the word ‘trick’ is used in the manner you described during your testimony.

Questions for Dr. Jane Lubchenco, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere and NOAA Administrator

- 1) On June 24, 2003, Mick Kelly wrote in an email:
“NOAA want to give us more money for the El Nino work with IGCN. How much do we have left from the last budget? I reckon most has been spent but we need to show some left to cover the costs of the trip Roger didn't make and also the fees/equipment/computer money we haven't spent otherwise NOAA will be suspicious. Politically this money may have to go through Simon's institute but there overhead rate is high so maybe not!”
 - In light of this admission of fraud, would you support an investigation into the scandal surrounding the leaked emails?
- 2) In your testimony, you state that President Obama “has made it clear that our choices [regarding climate change] will be informed by scientific knowledge...” If the data behind the science is deemed to be tainted or manipulated, would you and/or President Obama change your position to reflect that?
- 3) In your written testimony, you mention your meetings with leaders of international organizations during your trip to Geneva in early September for the World Climate Conference-3. You wrote: “There was strong agreement that services must be informed by relevant and credible science and must engage the users at all steps in the process.”
 - Did you interact with anyone from the University of East Anglia (UEA) at the conference?
 - Do you consider the UEA scientists’ methods relative to climate change to be in line with your definition of “credible science”?
- 4) You mention in your written testimony about temperatures in the United States. Last year, NASA published a top ten list of the hottest years on record. The top year was 1934. And of the top ten, six were before World War II. What is your opinion on this?
- 5) Recent research, including papers published this year in peer-reviewed journals, indicate that there is no correlation between atmospheric CO₂ concentration and ocean pH levels, and that recent acidification is within natural variations of pH, synchronous with the Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation. Have you read these 2009 papers authored by Dr. Wei and Dr. Liu in the *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*? If so, what is your scientific opinion of these papers?