

May 7, 2013

Dear Members of the US Senate and House of Representatives:

The Right Climate Stuff (TRCS) Research Team submitted the following comments on the January 11, 2013 Draft National Climate Assessment (DNCA). Our comments addressed significant errors and misstatements in the DNCA Executive Summary, Report Findings, and the underlying chapters.

As taxpayers, we expect full transparency by the National Climate Assessment Development and Advisory Committee (NCADAC) as the process continues including posting of our comments, posting of the responses to our comments, and all changes in the DNCA resulting from our comments. Also, Congress should require the NCADAC to post every version of the report drafts beginning with Version 1 as well as all of the changes together with the names of those responsible for revising the report.

For some reason the NCADAC chose to use its own comment system rather than the regulations.gov system supported by major agencies, including Commerce (NOAA) and NASA. The NCADAC system is neither transparent nor conducive to public participation. It does not accept graphics, even though data comments necessarily involve graphics. This constraint imposed severe restrictions on commenters.

The details of our comments can be found at:

http://www.therightclimatestuff.com/AGW_Science_Assess_Rpt-1.pdf or on our website at:

<http://www.therightclimatestuff.com/> **and select:**

[Anthropogenic Global Warming Science Assessment Report](#)

The Right Climate Stuff (TRCS) Research Team is a volunteer group of more than 20 scientists and engineers who are primarily retired veterans of our manned space program. We began our investigation into the controversial issue of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) in February 2012. We have reviewed, studied and debated available data and scientific reports regarding many factors that affect temperature variations of the earth's surface and atmosphere. **We**

note that our assessment report used more current papers and data than were used in the DNCA. We have also studied the well-documented beneficial, as well as potentially detrimental effects, of more CO₂ in our atmosphere.

Our study concentrated on the question: **"To what extent can human-related releases of CO₂ into the atmosphere cause earth surface temperature increases that would have harmful effects?"**

Here is a summary of our comments:

1. Contrary to the DNCA, the science that predicts the extent of Anthropogenic Global Warming is not settled science.

2. There is no convincing physical evidence of Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming. Most of the alarm regarding AGW results from output of unvalidated computer models. We understand scientific arguments regarding how doubling CO₂ in the atmosphere over a hundred years or more (if possible) can have a small direct warming effect, but we question the accuracy of feedback simulations in current models computing climate system responses that amplify CO₂ effects. Efforts to estimate climate sensitivity to CO₂ based solely on physical data, have large uncertainties because many factors affect global temperatures, and CO₂ levels rise in the atmosphere after the earth warms due to other factors. While paleoclimate data clearly show CO₂ levels rise and fall in the atmosphere hundreds of years after temperature rises and falls due to other causes, the evidence is very weak to support claims of a catastrophic rise in global temperatures caused by CO₂ emissions related to human activity.

3. Computer models need to be validated before being used in critical decision-making. Our manned aerospace backgrounds in dealing with models of complex phenomena have convinced us that this rule must be followed to avoid decisions with serious unintended consequences.

4. Because there is no immediate threat of global warming requiring swift corrective action, we have time to study global climate changes and improve our prediction accuracy. While there are many benefits due to some global warming, the major threats appear to be associated with a net loss of Greenland and

Antarctica ice sheet mass that would contribute to a gradual sea-level rise. The history, current trends, and specific causes of ice sheet melting and ice accumulation by precipitation must be better understood before determining how best to respond to threats of accelerated sea-level rise.

5. Our US government is over-reacting to concerns about Anthropogenic Global Warming. More CO₂ in the atmosphere would be beneficial for forest and crop growth to support the earth's growing population, so control of CO₂ emissions is not an obvious best solution to hyped-up concerns regarding AGW. Eventually the earth will run out of fossil fuels and alternative energy sources will be required. Market forces will (and should) play a big role in this transition to alternative energy sources. Government funding of promising research and development objectives for alternative energy sources appears to be a better option at this time than expenditures of enormous resources to limit CO₂ emissions.

6. A wider range of solution options should be studied for global warming or cooling threats from any credible cause. CO₂ effectiveness in controlling global average temperatures or sea levels has not been established. More reliable and greater control authority may be available from engineering solutions that would accommodate the beneficial aspects of more CO₂ in the atmosphere.

We will continue to advance and update our knowledge on this important subject and we will revise and publish our updates as necessary.

We are providing this information to members of Congress while you are formulating our national energy policies and national budget. Your decisions in this area will have a large impact on our national economy and available energy sources as well as our cost of living. We hope that you will consider our recommendations, because our findings **do not** support the conclusion that increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere is a significant factor causing detrimental global warming. Our intent is to save trillions of dollars that would be spent unnecessarily to restrict CO₂ emissions, when there is no indication

that this would have a significant effect on the climate. In fact, trees, grass, rainforests, corn, and all the fruits and vegetables would see significant growth (about 30% to 50% more, with less than a doubling of CO₂) because CO₂ is a plant fertilizer.

Our team gets no funding for this voluntary work, which we provide purely as a patriotic duty without enhancing our personal income. Some people view “skeptics” of Anthropogenic Global Warming” (AGW or “man-made Global Warming”) as enemies of the environment. This is far from the case. If some sources of energy cause pollution, judge them on their real faults, not on CO₂ emissions. Contrary to what EPA has declared, CO₂ is not a pollutant and it has not been proved with empirical data that it causes significant detrimental warming.

Moreover, a specific temperature rise problem has not been defined in terms of a detrimental deviation from an expected norm. Current temperature trends are well within the global temperature variations of the last 10,000 years while CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere were relatively constant. If a problem exists, it can be shown to exist in a certain locality or region. Using our disciplined Problem Analysis methods practiced in our manned space program, we have yet to find a specific such problem defined; and therefore, no root cause of a non-existent problem can be confidently established without better definition of the What?, Where?, When? And How Much? characteristics of the problem.

We would be happy to discuss our findings in more depth with you and your staff.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Harold H. Doiron".

Harold H. Doiron, PhD
Chairman, The Right Climate Stuff Research Team

House Science, Space, and Technology

Republican Members (22)

[Lamar Smith](#), Texas*

[Ralph M. Hall](#), Texas

[Randy Neugebauer](#), Texas

[Michael T. McCaul](#), Texas

[Steve Stockman](#), Texas

[Bill Posey](#), Florida

[Cynthia Lummis](#), Wyoming

[Randy Weber](#), Texas

[Chris Stewart](#), Utah

*Full Committee Chair +Chairman

Emeritus **Vice Chair/Committee

Democratic Members (17)

[Eddie Bernice Johnson](#), Texas

[MarcVeasey](#), (D-Texas)

Energy Subcommittee

Republican Members

Cynthia Lummis, (R-WY) Chairman

Texas Ralph M. Hall (R-Texas)

Randy Neugebauer (R-Texas)

Michael McCaul (R-Texas)

Randy Weber (R-Texas)

Democrat Members

[MarcVeasey](#), (D-Texas)

Environment Subcommittee

Republican Members

Chris Stewart, Utah, Chairman

Randy Neugebauer (R-Texas)

Randy Weber (R-Texas)

Energy and Commerce

Republican Members

[Fred Upton \(MI\)](#) - Chairman

[Ralph Hall \(TX\)](#)

[Joe Barton \(TX\)](#) - Chairman Emeritus

[Michael C. Burgess \(TX\)](#)

[Marsha Blackburn \(TN\)](#) - Vice Chairman

[Steve Scalise \(LA\)](#) Chair Rep Study Cmte

[Cathy McMorris Rodgers \(WA\)](#) Leadership

[Pete Olson \(TX\)](#)

Democratic Members

- Ranking Member

[Gene Green \(TX\)](#)

House Natural Resources Committee:

[Louie Gohmert](#)

[Bill Flores](#)

Senate Env & Pub Wks

Senate Minority Committee Members

[David Vitter](#)

[James M. Inhofe](#)

[John Barrasso](#)

[Jeff Sessions](#)

Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation

John Thune

Ted Cruz