

**To:** Steven Koonin [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] Yamada, Richard (Yujiro)[yamada.richard@epa.gov]  
**From:** Bowman, Liz  
**Sent:** Thur 9/7/2017 5:49:03 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Climate science

Awesome, thanks for the quick response.

**From:** Steven Koonin [mailto:Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 1:45 PM  
**To:** Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>; Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Climate science

Of course, I like Rich's two references.

I'd also note that even the IPCC says we don't know how the climate will respond to growing GHGs to within a factor of 3 (and that range isn't shrinking with time).

And then there's the following text from pg 58 of the CSSR 5OD (outed by the NYT):

*Key remaining uncertainties relate to the precise magnitude and nature of changes at global, and particularly regional, scales, and especially for extreme events and our ability to observe these*

*changes at sufficient resolution and to simulate and attribute such changes using climate models.*

**From:** Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) [mailto:yamada.richard@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov> [Ex. 6 - Steven Koonin personal email]  
**Subject:** RE: Climate science

Hi Liz,

I would also like Steve to chime in, but here are two starting points just to show you the complexity of science, and the factors that are involved – the earth's climate is one large complex system, with many, many variables. The first is a an APS event that was convened by Steve with 6 experts to debate the matter:

<http://www.aps.org/policy/statements/upload/climate-seminar-transcript.pdf>

A level summary can be found here:

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/climate-science-is-not-settled-1411143565>

Thanks,

Richard

**From:** Bowman, Liz

**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 1:31 PM

**To:** Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <[yamada.richard@epa.gov](mailto:yamada.richard@epa.gov)>;

Ex. 6 - Steven Koonin personal email

**Subject:** FW: Climate science

Can either of you provide any support for this question? Any specific studies or published papers that I can link to?

**From:** Devin Henry [<mailto:dhenry@thehill.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 1:28 PM

**To:** Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Climate science

Thanks Liz. I may have asked this before, but what research or science is the administrator relying on when he says there are unanswered questions? I'm just wondering where he's coming from when he says the science isn't settled.

Thanks,

Devin

On Thu, Sep 7, 2017 at 1:12 PM, Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)> wrote:

Hi Devin -- I would argue we are doing the exact opposite -- we are putting the science front and center, because we believe that Americans deserve a robust, open debate about the science around climate change. This is important to understanding the questions that remain unanswered, so that we can focus our country's resources and taxpayer dollars accordingly. As Administrator Pruitt believes: healthy debate is the lifeblood of American democracy.

**On additional background:** Please note that Cathy **Stepp** is Principal Deputy Regional Administrator in Region 7 (Kansas City).

And, I think it is important to understand that Administrator Pruitt has said that 'healthy debate is the lifeblood of American democracy.' And, that this issue has inspired one of the major policy debates of our time -- a debate that is far from settled. That debate should be encouraged, not silenced.

Thank you for the opportunity to include our voice -- Liz

**From:** Devin Henry [mailto:[dhenry@thehill.com](mailto:dhenry@thehill.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 10:14 AM

**To:** Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Climate science

Morning Liz,

I'm working on a story about the proliferation of climate change skeptics in the Trump administration. The news peg is the upcoming confirmation fight over Sam Clovis (USDA) and Jim Bridenstine (NASA).

But I'm going to also write about comments and proposals from Scott Pruitt, as well, including his "primary driver" comment, and his red-team-blue-team effort. Will also note Cathy Steep's appointment as deputy administrator and her history of questioning climate science.

Wanted to see if you have a statement that I could attribute to you? Basically: how does the EPA respond to criticism that the administrator and other agency officials are downplaying the science of climate change and working to raise questions about the scientific consensus on this issue? What is the agency's strategy on the issue of climate change science?

Deadline is 4:30 today. Give me a call on my cell if you want to chat. Thanks.

-Devin

--

Devin Henry

Staff Writer, The Hill

P: [\(202\) 349-8127](tel:(202)349-8127)

C: [\(952\) 913-7254](tel:(952)913-7254)

Twitter: [@dhenry](https://twitter.com/dhenry)

--

Devin Henry

Staff Writer, The Hill

P: (202) 349-8127

C: (952) 913-7254

Twitter: [@dhenry](https://twitter.com/dhenry)