

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN DOCUMENTS IN HIS POSSESSION RELATING TO THE ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE COASTAL REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 15, 2005.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BOEHLERT, from the Committee on Science,
submitted the following

ADVERSE REPORT

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H. Res. 515]

The Committee on Science, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 515), of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States, having considered the same, report unfavorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution not be agreed to.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Purpose of the Bill	2
II. Background and Need for the Legislation	2
III. Summary of Hearings	2
IV. Committee Actions	2
V. Summary of Major Provisions of the Bill	2
VI. Committee Views	3
VII. Compliance with Public Law 104-4 (Unfunded Mandates)	3
VIII. Committee Oversight Findings and Recommendations	3
IX. Statement on General Performance Goals and Objectives	3
X. Constitutional Authority Statement	3
XI. Federal Advisory Committee Statement	3
XII. Congressional Accountability Act	4
XIII. Committee Recommendations	4
XIV. Minority Views	5
XV. Proceedings of Full Committee Markup	7

I. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

House Resolution 515 requests the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, all documents (including minutes and memos) in his possession relating to the effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States produced by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Weather Service, the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Assessment Synthesis Team, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

II. BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

House Resolution 515 is a resolution of inquiry, which, pursuant to rule XIII, clause 7, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, directs the Committee to act on the resolution within 14 legislative days, or a privileged motion to discharge the Committee is in order.

Under the rules and precedents of the House, a resolution of inquiry is the means by which the House requests information from the President of the United States or the head of an executive department. According to 'Deschler's Precedents,' it is a 'simple resolution making a direct request or demand of the President or the head of an executive department to furnish the House of Representatives with specific factual information in the possession of the executive branch.'

III. SUMMARY OF HEARINGS

The Committee held no hearings on the resolution.

IV. COMMITTEE ACTIONS

On October 26, 2005, Congressman Dennis Kucinich of Ohio introduced H. Res. 515, which was referred to the Committee on Science.

On November 9, 2005, the Committee on Science met to consider H. Res. 515. No amendments were offered. The resolution failed on a recorded vote of 11 yeas to 16 nays.

Mr. Ehlert moved that the Committee adversely report the resolution to the House with the recommendation that the resolution not be agreed to and that the staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes. With a quorum present, the motion was agreed to by voice vote.

V. SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

House Resolution 515 requests the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, all documents (including minutes and memos) in his possession relating to the effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States produced by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Weather Service, the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Assessment Synthesis Team, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

VI. COMMITTEE VIEWS

The resolution seeks information the President has relating to climate change. However, it is not clear what documents the sponsors of the resolution are seeking, why the sponsors are seeking the documents, the degree to which the information they seek can be achieved more easily through other means or even is publicly available, or what decisions the President has made with the documents that justify a resolution of inquiry. The Committee further believes that the resolution is so broadly worded as to capture almost any document relating to climate change within a significant portion of the executive branch.

The amount of data the federal agencies have produced “relating to the effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States” is enormous. The United States has invested heavily for over 15 years in efforts to understand the highly complex physical phenomenon that is the Earth’s climate, how and why it is changing, and what effects those changes may have.

The Administration estimates that these efforts are funded at approximately \$3 billion a year. More than a dozen agencies are involved. For example, NASA launches research satellites to detect trace greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. NSF makes thousands of grants to individual researchers in universities across the nation who study climate change. NOAA’s research labs try to better understand the carbon cycle, the role of the oceans in climate, and the gaseous content of the atmosphere. And USGS produces high resolution maps showing precisely how every acre of the U.S. coast rises from the sea.

The Committee believes that complying with this resolution would require enormous resources to no apparent end. Complying with the resolution would not advance any public policy goal. Therefore, the Committee believes that such a resolution must be reported adversely and not brought before the House.

VII. COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104-4

H. Res. 515 contains no unfunded mandates.

VIII. COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee held no oversight activities with respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

IX. STATEMENT ON GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The rule requiring a statement of performance goals and objectives is inapplicable.

X. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority for H. Res. 515.

XI. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

H. Res. 515 does not create any advisory committees.

XII. CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The Committee finds that H. Res. 515 does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104-1).

XIII. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

On November 9, 2005, a quorum being present, the Committee on Science adversely reported H. Res. 515, by voice vote.

XIV. MINORITY VIEWS

We fully recognized this Resolution would not receive favorable consideration by this Committee or the House of Representatives. We supported the Resolution in Committee to send a message regarding our broader concerns about the lack of cooperation this Administration has demonstrated repeatedly with respect to supplying accurate and complete information in a timely fashion to the Congress.

We have a responsibility to oversee the programs and policies authorized by Congress. We cannot fulfill that responsibility if the Administration does not act in a forthright manner to supply information about the expenditures and activities of the programs they are managing.

We simply cannot agree with the Chairman's assertion during the markup of this Resolution that our requests for information have been responded to in a thorough and timely fashion either in this Committee or in the Congress more broadly.

To cite just a few examples within the Committee's jurisdiction, requests for information from NASA on such topics as the Space Station Contingency Plan and their Strategic Resources Review received vague responses containing little substance. An information request dating back to 2002 on the plan for addressing the *Soyuz* in relation to NASA's decision to cancel the U.S. crew return vehicle in 2002 and the requirements of the Iran Nonproliferation Act received a response in the form of a suggested amendment to the INA just this year.

As Ranking Member Representative Bart Gordon indicated in his opening statement, we do not wish to dwell on the past experiences with information requests. We want to work with our Republican colleagues and the Administration to fulfill our obligation to the public to oversee the programs in our charge and to develop good public policy. We must have good information supplied in a timely fashion to accomplish this important goal.

BART GORDON.
JERRY F. COSTELLO.
LYNN C. WOOLSEY.
DAVID WU.
BRAD SHERMAN.
RUSS CARNAHAN.
BRIAN BAIRD.
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.
MICHAEL M. HONDA.
DENNIS MOORE.
BRAD MILLER.
MARK UDALL.

6

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.
JIM COSTA.
JIM MATHESON.
CHARLIE MELANCON.

**XV. PROCEEDINGS OF THE FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
ON H. RES. 515, OF INQUIRY REQUESTING THE PRESI-
DENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE TO THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN DOCUMENTS
IN HIS POSSESSION RELATING TO THE ANTICIPATED
EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE COASTAL RE-
GIONS OF THE UNITED STATES**

**MARKUP ON H. RES. 515, OF INQUIRY RE-
QUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES TO PROVIDE TO THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN DOCUMENTS
IN HIS POSSESSION RELATING TO THE AN-
TICIPATED EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE
ON THE COASTAL REGIONS OF THE UNITED
STATES**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2005

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:10 a.m., in Room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Sherwood L. Boehlert [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The Committee on Science will come to order.

Pursuant to notice, the Committee on Science meets to consider the following measure: H. Res. 515, of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the authority to recess the committee at any point during consideration of these matters and without objection, it is so ordered.

Let us proceed with the markup, and I will start with an opening statement. The question is, is this markup really necessary, and the answer is yes and no. I want to welcome everyone here. I wish we didn't have to take time for this resolution but under rules of the House, committees must act on resolutions of inquiry within 14 days or they can be brought up under a privileged motion on the House floor, and I certainly don't want to be responsible for the whole House having to devote time to this measure when there are so many other pressing matters on our agenda.

I want to make it clear at the outset that any debate or vote on this measure should not be seen as any kind of a barometer on what the House thinks or is willing to do about global climate change. You know where I am coming from. Personally, I know it is for real. That is what the scientific consensus tells us. I know man has contributed to it. There is no doubt in my mind about that, and I noticed just the other day, even the National Association of Evangelical Churches has been saying publicly that our stewardship of this planet Earth is critically important and we better get on dealing with sensitive subjects. Personally, I support mandatory caps on carbon dioxide and I think there is growing concern around the country about climate change, and let me say I am particularly proud of my green credentials and I think there is no one who is more outspoken about the need to address the environment in a meaningful, responsible way.

But I don't think this resolution would advance the debate on climate change one iota. Rather, the solution is broadly drafted and excuse me for suggesting this, but a partisan political ploy that tries to create an artificial issue about documents. I don't know how that helps anyone. I don't see how that significantly advances the debate.

It is difficult even to determine how anyone would comply with the resolution. What documents are being sought? Every administration document relating to climate change and U.S. coasts? How many truckloads of material would that require?

What would we do with the information if we got it? What would we find? What new insight would we arrive at concerning climate change or climate policy? The resolution reminds me about the old line about dogs chasing cars. What would they do if they actually caught one? What would anyone do if this resolution succeeded?

Let me tell you how I try to be guided in dealing with a subject like global climate change. I try to listen more than I talk, listen to the National Academy of Science, listening to eminent scientists in the field and I don't just listen to the people who happen to agree with the conclusion I have arrived at. I listen to the people on the other side of the argument. And you know what? The people on the other side of the argument are dwindling to a few and the consensus is growing on the side of the argument that this is for real and we have to deal with it in a responsible way.

The more I have read the short resolution, the more baffling I find it. Information on the potential impact of climate change on U.S. coasts is readily available. The potential impacts of climate change on coastal areas are the subject of countless scientific papers. This Committee more than any other committee of the Congress knows that.

So what prompted this? Has anyone sought specific documents for specific reasons under standard procedures and been denied? Not that we know of.

But then again, there is not much that we know of related to this resolution because it was introduced without any serious discussion with me and I do want to point out that the author extended the courtesy to me to personally present to me a copy of the resolution so I wasn't blindsided, but there was no, you know, serious discussion.

By now, I assume no one has any doubts about where I stand in the matter. Now, there is division on both sides of this on that sensitive subject but no one should have any misunderstanding about my position. It is for real. We have got to deal with it in a meaningful way. I don't just say that to the press. I have said it to the President of the United States in one-on-one meetings with him.

I should add that we hope to have a subcommittee hearing on the subject next month on the Administration's draft Climate Change Technology plan. That is something we are following very carefully.

So we will continue to work on this important issue unimpeded, I hope, by gamesmanship. That offers nothing of substance to the ongoing discussion that has to engage more of us all the time.

[Statement of Mr. Boehlert follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SHERWOOD BOEHLERT FOR MARKUP ON H.
RES. 515

I want to welcome everyone to what I hope will be a brief mark-up of what I see as a frivolous resolution on a serious subject, global climate change. I wish we did not have to take time on this resolution, but under the rules of the House, Committees must act on resolutions of inquiry within 14 days or they can be brought up under a privileged motion on the House floor. And I certainly don't want to be responsible for the whole House having to devote time to this measure.

I want to make clear at the outset that any debate or vote on this measure should not be seen as any kind of barometer of what the House thinks, or is willing to do about, global climate change. Personally, I support mandatory caps on carbon dioxide, and I think there is growing concern about climate change around the country.

But I don't think that this resolution would advance the debate on climate change one iota. Rather, this resolution is a broadly drafted, partisan political ploy that tries to create a phony issue about documents. I don't see how that helps anyone.

It's difficult even to determine how anyone would comply with the resolution. What documents are being sought? Every Administration document related to climate change and U.S. coasts? How many truckloads of materials would that be?

Moreover, what would we do with this information if we got it? What would we find? What new insight would we arrive at concerning climate change or climate policy? The resolution reminds me about the old line about dogs chasing cars: What would they do if they caught one? What would anyone do if this resolution succeeded?

The more I've read this short resolution, the more baffling I've found it. Information on the potential impact of climate change on U.S. coasts is readily available. The potential impacts of climate change on coastal areas are the subject of countless scientific papers.

So what prompted this? Has anyone sought specific documents for specific reasons under standard procedures and been denied? Not that we know of.

But then again, there's not much that we know of related to this resolution because it was introduced without any discussion with me, even though, under House rules, it has to move swiftly. This is not the way things work around here if one wants to solve a problem rather than try to score a political point.

By now, I assume no one has any doubts about where I stand on this matter. I urge my colleagues to swiftly defeat this resolution so this Committee can return to more worthy business—including looking further into climate change. I should add that we hope to have a subcommittee hearing in the next month on the Administration's draft Climate Change Technology Program plan.

So we will continue to work on this important issue—unimpeded, I hope, by political gamesmanship.

Chairman BOEHLERT. With that, the Chair is pleased to recognize Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for scheduling this meeting on House Resolution 515. Anyone who has spent time with you on the Science Committee knows you have a

sincere interest in the issue of climate change. You have always addressed this issue in a thoughtful and serious, bipartisan fashion and I know that your green slip is particularly showing this week on votes that will be coming up soon.

In general, our Committee has demonstrated bipartisan support for a wide variety of climate science and energy research programs at many of the agencies in our jurisdiction, and like you, I believe we need strong science programs and strong analysis to assess the magnitude and possible impacts of a shift in the Earth's climate. Good information is an essential ingredient in the development of good policy.

I believe you would agree, it is not enough to just fund strong science programs and it is not enough just to produce scientific results and analysis.

To stimulate debate and craft good policy, information must be made public.

Unfortunately, this Administration at times has not regarded Congress and the public as true partners in crafting the policy directions of this country.

Let us face it—sharing information with Congress and the public has not been this Administration's strong suit. Individual Members' and Committees' requests for information have not received the serious attention and responses that we must have to fulfill our responsibility to oversee the programs and policies we authorize.

As a result, some Members are resorting to introducing resolutions of inquiry to send a message to the Administration. The message is simple. Respond to our requests and provide the Congress with the information and analysis we require to serve our constituents. We want solid, unbiased factual information, not selective information that has been manipulated to serve a narrow political interest.

Whether we are talking about climate change or the cost of a Medicare prescription drug plan, Congress must have good information.

Mr. Chairman, we all know this Resolution will go no further than this Committee meeting today. However, I am supporting the resolution to send a message to the Administration.

I do not want to dwell on past mistakes, but I think we should learn from them.

I hope the Administration will in the future cooperate with Congress and provide information in a timely fashion. We must work together to face up to our nation's challenges and to develop clear policies to address them.

I want to work with you and the Administration to ensure we give the American people the good public policy they deserve.

[Statement of Mr. Gordon follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BART GORDON, RANKING MEMBER

Thank you, Mr. Chairman for scheduling this meeting on House Resolution 515. Anyone who has spent time with you on the Science Committee knows you have a sincere interest in the issue of climate change. You have always addressed this issue in a thoughtful, serious, bipartisan fashion.

In general, our Committee has demonstrated bipartisan support for a wide variety of climate science and energy research programs at many of the agencies in our jurisdiction. Like you, I believe we need strong science programs and solid analysis to assess the magnitude and possible impacts of a shift in the earth's climate. Good

information is an essential ingredient in the development of good policy. I believe you would agree, it is not enough to fund strong science programs. It is not enough to produce scientific results and analyses.

To stimulate debate and craft good policy, information must be made public. Unfortunately, this Administration—at times—has not regarded the Congress and the public as true partners in crafting the policy directions for this country. Let's face it—sharing information with Congress and the public has not been this Administration's strong suit. Individual Members' and Committees' requests for information have not received the serious attention and responses that we must have to fulfill our responsibility to oversee the programs and policies we authorize.

As a result, some Members are resorting to introducing Resolutions of Inquiry to send a message to the Administration. The message is simply this. Respond to our requests and provide the Congress with the information and analyses we require to serve our constituents. We want solid, unbiased factual information, not selective information that has been manipulated to serve a narrow political interest. Whether we are talking about climate change or the cost of a Medicare prescription drug plan, Congress must have good information.

Mr. Chairman, we all know this Resolution will not go any further than this Committee meeting today. However, I am supporting the Resolution to send a message to the Administration. I do not want to dwell on past mistakes, but I think we should learn from them. I hope the Administration will, in the future, cooperate with the Congress and provide information in a timely fashion. We must work together to face our nation's challenges and develop clear policies to address them. I want to work with you and the Administration to ensure we give the American people the good public policy they deserve.

[Statement of Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson follows:]

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

As the Science Committee marks up H. Res. 515 today, I would like to voice my support of this bill. This resolution of inquiry requests the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States.

In my District of Dallas, Texas, climate change and global warming are very important issues. Texas is known for its hot summers and also for its poor air quality. On top of that, Texas has some of the highest rates of uninsured individuals in the nation. Poor quality and poor access to health care are a dangerous combination. Americans everywhere deserve to know how climate change will affect their health and daily lives.

This resolution sends a strong message to the Administration to come clean to the American people about what it knows about climate change.

I join 149 of my colleagues in supporting this H. Res. 515.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman BOEHLERT. Thank you very much. And as usual, the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee and I find ourselves in basic agreement. We need information in order to have informed decision making. I can speak on a lot of subjects but the subject of the moment, I have had no difficulty in getting information from the Administration. The only difficulty I have encountered is that that information leads me to a somewhat different approach in dealing with a subject but no difficulty.

I have had no difficulty talking directly to the President of the United States on this subject to the point where I was in a meeting with him on a very sensitive issue, CAFTA, in which we were all lobbied and lobbied right up to the 11th hour and 59th minute, and in the Oval Office, we were talking about CAFTA, and he paused and the President looked at me and he said, "Did you read my speech to the G-8 on global warming," and I said "Well, I have to confess, Mr. President, I don't read all your speeches. I read reports of it." He said, "Well, you ought to read it. It will be interesting." So I got the speech and read it and quite frankly, it was an inter-

esting speech. But you all know that on some of these environmental issues, the Administration and I don't always march down the same path but I have had no difficulty in getting information from the Administration and I would think that this committee can point with pride to a record, when we have requested information, we have received it—bipartisan requests. It hasn't always been as timely as we would like but I understand that.

Quite frankly, the Administration just doesn't stop everything when they get a request from Boehlert or the Science Committee and say well, we have got to accommodate him. I understand that.

But well, that is enough said. Let us proceed with the markup, and here is where we are. We will now consider H. Res. 515, of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession related to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution is considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and without objection, it is so ordered.

[H. Res. 515 follows:]

109TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 515

Of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 26, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHLAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF,

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Science

RESOLUTION

Of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States.

1 *Resolved*, That the President of the United States is
2 requested to provide to the House of Representatives, not
3 later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this reso-
4 lution, all documents (including minutes and memos) in
5 his possession relating to the effects of climate change on
6 the coastal regions of the United States produced by the
7 National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Na-
8 tional Weather Service, the National Science Foundation,
9 the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,
10 the National Assessment Synthesis Team, and the US Ge-
11 ological Survey.

○

Chairman BOEHLERT. Are there any amendments? Hearing none, the vote then is on the resolution. H. Res. 515, of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession related to the anticipated effects of climate change on the coastal regions of the United States. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed will say no. In the opinion of the Chairs, the no's have it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, we would request a recorded vote.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The gentleman requests a recorded vote. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Boehlert.

Chairman BOEHLERT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Boehlert votes no. Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Hall votes no. Mr. Smith.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Weldon.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Rohrabacher votes no. Mr. Calvert.

Mr. CALVERT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Calvert votes no. Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Bartlett votes no. Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Ehlers votes no. Mr. Gutknecht.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gutknecht votes no. Mr. Lucas.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Lucas votes no. Mrs. Biggert.

Mrs. BIGGERT. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Biggert votes no. Mr. Gilchrest.

Mr. GILCHREST. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gilchrest votes no. Mr. Akin.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Johnson votes no. Mr. Forbes.

Mr. FORBES. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Forbes votes no. Mr. Bonner.

Mr. BONNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Bonner votes no. Mr. Feeney.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Inglis.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Reichert.

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Sodrel.

Mr. SODREL. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Sodrel votes no. Mr. Schwarz.

Mr. SCHWARZ. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Schwarz votes no. Mr. McCaul.

Mr. MCCAUL. No.

The CLERK. Mr. McCaul votes no. Mr. Gordon.
Mr. GORDON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gordon votes yes. Mr. Costello.
Mr. COSTELLO. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Costello votes yes. Ms. Johnson.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Woolsey.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Hooley.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Udall.
Mr. UDALL. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Udall votes yes. Mr. Wu.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Honda.
Mr. HONDA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Honda votes yes. Mr. Miller.
Mr. MILLER. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Miller votes yes. Mr. Davis.
Mr. DAVIS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Davis votes yes. Mr. Carnahan.
Mr. CARNAHAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Carnahan votes yes. Mr. Lipinski.
Mr. LIPINSKI. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lipinski votes yes. Ms. Jackson Lee.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Sherman.
Mr. SHERMAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Sherman votes yes. Mr. Baird.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Matheson.
Mr. MATHESON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Matheson votes yes. Mr. Costa.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Green.
Mr. GREEN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Green votes yes. Mr. Melancon.
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Moore.
[No response.]
Chairman BOEHLERT. The clerk will report.
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, yes, 11, no, 16.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE - ROLL CALL - 109th CONGRESS

DATE: 11/9/05 SUBJECT: VOTE ON THE RESOLUTION (H.Res. 515)

Rm.	Phone	Member	Yes	No	Not Voting	Present	Absent
2246	53665	Mr. Boehlert, R-NY		✓			
2405	56673	Mr. Hall, R-TX		✓			
2184	54236	Mr. Smith, R-TX					
2466	52011	Mr. Weldon, R-PA		✓			
2338	52415	Mr. Rohrabacher, R-CA		✓			
2201	51986	Mr. Calvert, R-CA		✓			
2412	52721	Mr. Bartlett, R-MD		✓			
1714	53831	Mr. Ehlers, R-MI		✓			
425	52472	Mr. Gutknecht, R-MN		✓			
2342	55565	Mr. Lucas, R-OK		✓			
1317	53515	Mrs. Biggert, R-IL		✓			
2245	55311	Mr. Gilchrest, R-MD		✓			
117	52561	Mr. Akin, R-MO		✓			
1229	52371	Mr. Johnson, R-IL		✓			
307	56365	Mr. Forbes, R-VA		✓			
315	54931	Mr. Bonner, R-AL		✓			
323	52706	Mr. Feeney, R-FL					
330	56030	Mr. Inglis, R-SC					
1223	57761	Mr. Reichert, R-WA		✓			
1508	55315	Mr. Sodrel, R-IN		✓			
128	56276	Mr. Schwarz, R-MI		✓			
415	52401	Mr. McCaul, R-TX		✓			
2304	54231	Mr. Gordon, D-TN	✓				
2269	55661	Mr. Costello, D-IL	✓				
1511	58885	Ms. Johnson, D-TX					
2263	55161	Ms. Woolsey, D-CA					
2430	55711	Ms. Hooley, D-OR					
240	52161	Mr. Udall, D-CO	✓				
1023	50855	Mr. Wu, D-OR					
1713	52631	Mr. Honda, D-CA	✓				
1722	53032	Mr. Miller, D-NC	✓				
410	56831	Mr. Davis, D-TN	✓				
1232	52671	Mr. Carnahan, D-MO	✓				
1217	55701	Mr. Lipinski, D-IL	✓				
2435	53816	Ms. Jackson Lee, D-TX	✓				
1030	55911	Mr. Sherman, D-CA	✓				
1421	53536	Mr. Baird, D-WA					
1222	53011	Mr. Matheson, D-UT	✓				
1004	53341	Mr. Costa, D-CA					
1529	57508	Mr. Green, D-TX	✓				
404	54031	Mr. Melancon, D-LA					
1727	52865	Mr. Moore, D-KS					
TOTAL			11	16			

Attest: *Vivian M. Torricelli* (Clerk)

Chairman BOEHLERT. The motion is defeated. I recognize Dr. Ehlers to offer a motion.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee adversely report H. Res. 515 to the House with a recommendation that the resolution not be agreed to. Furthermore, I move that staff be instructed to prepare the legislative report and make necessary technical and conforming changes.

Chairman BOEHLERT. The question is on the motion to report the resolution adversely. Those in favor of the motion will signify by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the resolution is adversely reported. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table. Before moving on, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rohrabacher be permitted to have an article he wants inserted into the record.

[The article follows:]

Weather Seer: 'We're Lucky'

'Eight of the last 10 years have been very active—we've never had as much activity. Yet we went from 1992 until last year with no hurricanes coming through Florida'



METEOROLOGIST WILLIAM GRAY MAY BE THE WORLD'S MOST FAMOUS HURRICANE expert. More than two decades ago, as professor of atmospheric science and head of the Tropical Meteorology Project at Colorado State University, he pioneered the science of hurricane forecasting. Each December, six months before the start of hurricane season, the now 75-year-old Gray and his team issue a long-range prediction of the number of major tropical storms that will arise in the Atlantic Ocean basin, as well as the number of hurricanes (with sustained winds of 74 miles per hour or more) and intense hurricanes (with winds of at least 111 mph). This year, Gray expects more activity, with 15 named storms, including 8 hurricanes. Four of them, he says, will be intense.

How did you get involved in predicting hurricanes?

G: It was an outgrowth of my teaching. We always wanted to know when we went to Florida whether the Atlantic basin would have an active season or not, because it has the most variable season of the global basins. There are some years with very few storms and other years with a large number of them. Twenty-five years ago, there was no way to tell. We tried studying local variation in the sea surface temperatures in the western Atlantic, the surface pressures, the wind shears, and various other things, but we could not develop a scheme that worked very well. Then I discovered that the secret was to look globally. I found that if there is an El Niño in the Pacific, the Atlantic seasons tend to be rather weak; if there is not an El Niño, they tend to be stronger. Then we found that if the global stratospheric winds blow from the west, we tend to have more storms. We looked at West African rain—we hadn't been doing that—and found that had a precursor signal to it too. The more we learned, the better the predictions got.

How can you predict hurricanes six or nine months in advance but not the weather next week?

G: We don't say where or when the storms are going to occur. We give a number for the season. It is a different prediction.

What is the point in predicting the severity of the season if you can't say where a storm will hit, or when?

G: People want to know what the odds look like, and we can say something about that by looking at the conditions that existed before the active season in prior years and comparing those to what we see now.

A few years ago when there were quite a few light seasons in a row, you said Florida had just been lucky—and that it was going to end.

G: They've been *extremely* lucky. The last major storm to come through Florida, before hurricane Andrew hit in 1992, was hurricane Betsy in 1965, which went through the Keys. Eight of the last 10 years have been very active—in fact, we've never had as much activity on the records, going back to about 1870 or so, as in the past 10 years—and yet we went from 1992

DISCOVER DIALOGUE

until last year with no hurricanes coming through Florida. If we look back earlier, from 1931 through 1965, Florida was hit 11 times with major storms. The major storms, the category 3, 4, and 5 hurricanes, only account for about 25 percent of the number of named storms, but they cause about 80 to 85 percent of the damage.

There was a lot of devastation last year.

That doesn't seem very lucky.

G: Although last year was a terrible year for them, it could have been worse because none of the four storms that affected the Florida region went into a highly populated area.

What do you expect over the next few years?

G: Our feeling is that the United States is going to be seeing hurricane damage over the next decade or so on a scale way beyond what we have seen in the past.

Is there a reason so many storms reached land last year?

G: What made last year so unusual were the steering currents. In 9 of the previous 10 years from 1995 through 2003, we tended to have this upper-level trough—or low-pressure area—off the northeast United States, and that brought the westerly winds down into the tropics, where they curved the storms out to sea before they could hit the United States. On average, about one in 3 major Atlantic storms hits land, so by all reckoning we should have had 9 or 10 major storms hitting the United States since 1995. We only had 3 because of this trough. Last year, the thing changed. Instead of a trough off the northeastern United States, we had this high-pressure ridge, and that kept the westerly winds far north of the tropical Atlantic storms. The storms didn't curve away; they just kept coming westward.

What will happen this year?

G: We think that this year we probably won't curve all the storms, but we are not as confident of that as we are that this will be a pretty active year—a lot like last year.

How accurate can hurricane prediction get?

G: There are two types of prediction. The type we do is with climate, where we don't

'Our feeling is that the United States is going to be seeing hurricane damage over the next decade or so on a scale way beyond what we have seen in the past'

say when and where but we say the number. I think that will get slightly better if we keep working on it. The critical prediction is in the short range, 12 to 48 hours, of the track of the storm and of its intensity. Track prediction is getting a little better because researchers have been flying planes around the outside of the storm, measuring the steering currents. The errors in three-day track prediction now are equivalent to the errors you used to see in two-day predictions. But the skill at intensity predictions is still very small. That is a tougher nut to crack because it involves the complexity of the inner core of the storm.

A few years ago, you almost called it quits because you'd lost so much funding. What made you continue?

G: I don't have the budget that I had, so I have cut my project way back. I am in retirement. I'm still working every day, but I don't teach and I don't have as many graduate students and as much financial need. I've got a little money from Lexington Insurance out of Boston, and I have some National Science Foundation money. For years I haven't had any NOAA, NASA, or Navy money. But I'm having more fun. Right now I'm trying to work on this human-induced global-warming thing that I think is grossly exaggerated.

You don't believe global warming is causing climate change?

G: No. If it is, it is causing such a small part that it is negligible. I'm not disputing that there has been global warming. There was a lot of global warming in the

1930s and '40s, and then there was a slight global cooling from the middle '40s to the early '70s. And there has been warming since the middle '70s, especially in the last 10 years. But this is natural, due to ocean circulation changes and other factors. It is not human induced.

That must be a controversial position among hurricane researchers.

G: Nearly all of my colleagues who have been around 40 or 50 years are skeptical as hell about this whole global-warming thing. But no one asks us. If you don't know anything about how the atmosphere functions, you will of course say, "Look, greenhouse gases are going up, the globe is warming, they must be related." Well, just because there are two associations, changing with the same sign, doesn't mean that one is causing the other.

With last year's hurricane season so active, and this year's looking like it will be, won't people say it's evidence of global warming?

G: The Atlantic has had more of these storms in the last 10 years or so, but in other ocean basins, activity is slightly down. Why would that be so if this is climate change? The Atlantic is a special basin? The number of major storms in the Atlantic also went way down from the middle 1960s to the middle '90s, when greenhouse gases were going up.

Why is there scientific support for the idea?

G: So many people have a vested interest in this global-warming thing—all these big labs and research and stuff. The idea is to frighten the public, to get money to study it more. Now that the cold war is over, we have to generate a common enemy to support science, and what better common enemy for the globe than greenhouse gases?

Are your funding problems due in part to your views?

G: I can't be sure, but I think that's a lot of the reason. I have been around 50 years, so my views on this are well known. I had NOAA money for 30 some years, and then when the Clinton administration came in and Gore started directing some of the environmental stuff, I was cut off. I couldn't get any NOAA money. They turned down 13 straight proposals from me. ☐

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, the article is an interview with America's premiere meteorologist, William Gray, dealing with the issue of global warming suggesting that people did not get contracts for a number of years who disagreed with the global warming theory. This man himself debunks that theory. I would suggest all of us take a look at it if we are open minded on the issue and insert it in the record, please.

Chairman BOEHLERT. We will be glad to consider the minority scientific view. I move that members have two subsequent calendar days in which to submit supplemental minority or additional views on the measure. Without objection, so ordered. I want to thank the members for their attendance. This concludes the committee mark-up.

[Whereupon, at 10:27 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

