

February 10, 2017

Dear UCLA Professor Involved with AGW and PM2.5 Science,

You have not responded to my February 2, 2017 email message below regarding the February 9, 2017 [American Freedom Alliance Forum on Climate Change](#) featuring Dr. Wei-Hock “Willie” Soon, a world-renowned Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) skeptic. Also, you have not responded to my January 30, 2017 email message below to Dr. Jo Kay Chan Ghosh criticizing the [SCAQMD 2016 AQMP and PM2.5 science](#). AGW and PM2.5 science have been used as the basis for multibillion dollar regulations on Californians in spite of strong evidence of major flaws in AGW and PM2.5 science and related regulations. Thus, Dr. Soon and I request an opportunity to discuss this evidence with you as soon as possible.

If you decline to discuss AGW and PM2.5 science and related regulations with us, then we will assume that you are not concerned about these scientific matters and their adverse impact on Californians. We have been presenting our strong evidence to President Donald J. Trump, the US House Science Committee, the US House Energy Committee, and the US Senate Environment Committee. We hope that we do not have to present evidence that you, a major scientific leader at UCLA, are not concerned about flawed science that is having an adverse impact on Californians and, indeed, all Americans.

Thank you for giving serious consideration to our above request.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
Board Member, American Freedom Alliance
jenstrom@ucla.edu

Breitbart News February 9, 2017

Climate Skeptic Willie Soon Addresses Packed Audience in L.A.

by [Joel B. Pollak](#) 9 Feb 2017



LOS ANGELES — Dr. Wie-Hock “Willie” Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics addressed a gathering of the American Freedom Alliance on Thursday night at the Luxe Hotel, describing the current state of debate about climate change as “spitting science in the face” and “treating science like a piece of rubbish.”

Mixing humor and science, he entertained the gathering as he made the case for skepticism about climate change.

He began by mocking the degree to which carbon dioxide was treated like a toxic gas by proponents of radical policies on climate change. “Next it will be oxygen, it will be anything that you want on the chemical table,” he joked.

“The Sun is a primary driver of climate change — and has a far greater impact than changes in CO₂,” he said, in a slide presented to the packed audience of about 100 conservatives.

Another slide added: “Climate science is dangerously corrupted and co-opted by multiple anti-science forces and players.”

To the amusement of the audience, Dr. Soon played a clip of Al Sharpton mocking him on MSNBC, pointing to research funding he had received from fossil fuel companies. “It is really, truly, a badge of honor, Rev. Al Sharpton, to be accused by you of a conflict of interest,” he said.

Dr. Soon called much of the reporting about his work in the mainstream media “fake news.” And he mocked the fads and fashions that have sprung up around climate change.

For example, he said, the “locavore” movement, which stressed eating locally-produced food to save energy, actually increased greenhouse gases, because of the energy efficiencies achieved by larger and more established farms that benefited from economies of scale.

He also mocked California politicians for their statements on science — especially Governor Jerry Brown and former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. In 1977, he pointed out, Gov. Brown had warned of a drought of “immeasurable magnitude” — a meaningless phrase, in scientific terms.

The movement toward renewable energy sources, he said, was not a sign of progress, but regression toward the lower energy densities of the pre-industrial age. He also likened belief in carbon “pollution” to the superstitious beliefs of primitive civilizations, illustrating his point with a 1933 newspaper article describing a drought in Syria that was blamed by locals on yo-yo toys.

He then launched into his data-heavy scientific presentation in earnest. For all the focus on carbon dioxide, the most important greenhouse gas in the climate system was water vapor, he said. And carbon dioxide, he noted, was not a “pollutant,” as the term was conventionally used.

While it was true that the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide had been increasing, he said, and had passed 400 parts per million, the dominant effect of water vapor had helped flatten the greenhouse effect, such that the rise of global surface temperatures had slowed significantly.

He said that some climate scientists manipulated graphs to make climate change seem more severe than it was — for example, by representing temperature anomalies rather than absolute temperatures.

His latest work, he said, was in understanding how temperature data sets were constructed. He and his colleagues were examining data gathered in rural areas, to remove the distortion of measurements in urban areas. They found that there was, in fact, some surface temperature warming, albeit less severe than conventional data sets showed. But the effect, he said, was more likely the result of fluctuations in energy output from the sun, which in turn affected water vapor.

The major effect of cutting carbon dioxide emissions to zero, he said, would be “to kill and hurt poor people and greatly harm animals and the environment.”

In the past, Dr. Soon noted, the left had attacked his research because he had taken funding from fossil fuel companies. He cited the *New York Times* as one of his chief antagonists, after it ran a [disparaging profile](#) of him in 2015.

As a result, he said, he had not accepted any funding for his latest research on the composition and manipulation of climate data sets.

Joel B. Pollak is Senior Editor-at-Large at Breitbart News. He was named one of the “[most influential](#)” people in news media in 2016. His new book, [How Trump Won: The Inside Story of a Revolution](#), is available from Regnery. Follow him on Twitter at [@joelpollak](#).

From: James E. Enstrom [mailto:jenstrom@ucla.edu]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 9:43 AM
To: 'Aradhna Tripathi' <ripple@epss.ucla.edu>
Cc: 'Alex Hall' <alexhall@atmos.ucla.edu>
Subject: Invitation to February 9 AFA Climate Change Forum with Dr. Soon

February 2, 2017

Dear UCLA Professor,

I am writing because you signed “An Open Letter to President Donald Trump and His Administration” expressing your serious concerns about Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW), as described in the Sacramento Bee “[2,300 California scientists write to Trump over climate fears.](#)” I want you to know that a world-renowned AGW skeptic, Dr. Wei-Hock “Willie” Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, is speaking at the American Freedom Alliance Forum on Climate Change on February 9, 2017 at the Luxe Hotel Sunset, located one mile west of UCLA. See the AFA Announcement below. I invite you to attend this Forum so that you can engage in an academic dialog about AGW with Dr. Soon. The general nature of the Forum will be similar to the Heartland Climate Conferences (<http://climateconferences.heartland.org/>).

Please let me know as soon as possible if you can attend and I will provide specific details about the Forum. If you are unable to attend the Forum, please let me know if you can meet with Dr. Soon and me on the UCLA Campus, where we will be during February 10, 2017.

Thank you very much for your consideration regarding this important academic opportunity, which is highly relevant to United States scientific research policy.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
Board Member, American Freedom Alliance
jenstrom@ucla.edu



<http://www.americanfreedomalliance.org/eventsburningup.jsp>

BURNING UP! An American Freedom Alliance Forum on Climate Change

February 9, 2017

6 PM: Reception

7PM: Forum

Luxe Sunset Boulevard Hotel

\$35

[CLICK HERE FOR TICKETS](#)



About Willie Soon:

- Physicist, Solar, Stellar, and Planetary Sciences Division, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics
- Astronomer, Mount Wilson Observatory
- Chief Science Researcher, Center for Science and Public Policy
- Chief Science Advisor, Science and Public Policy Institute
- Senior Scientist, Marshall Institute

January 30, 2017

Jo Kay Chan Ghosh, Ph.D.
Health Effects Officer
South Coast Air Quality Management District
jghosh@aqmd.gov

Dear Dr. Ghosh,

I am writing to express my extreme disappointment with your December 8, 2016 Final Draft 2016 AQMP [Appendix I Health Effects](#). Your January 3, 2017 198-page document, [Responses to Comments on Appendix I](#), DOES NOT address the numerous critical comments that I submitted to you on [January 11, 2016](#) and [July 26, 2016 and August 15, 2016](#). Below I describe six major problems with the final version of Appendix I.

1. Appendix I DOES NOT comply with [California Health and Safety Code Section 40471 \(b\)](#). Instead of satisfying the requirement “the south coast district board, in conjunction with a public health organization or agency, shall prepare a report on the health impacts of particulate matter air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin,” you stated on page 188 of your Responses document “it is not the intention of this Appendix to assess whether there is or is not an effect of a specific air pollutant on any particular health endpoint . . .” Instead of satisfying the requirement to prepare Appendix I “in conjunction with a public health organization or agency,” you instead prepared it in conjunction with two aggressive regulatory agencies within CalEPA: OEHHA and CARB. Instead of satisfying the requirement that the “south coast district board shall hold public hearings concerning the report and the peer review,” you held four November 2016 public hearings which were conducted without the SCAQMD Board Members
2. Appendix I and your Responses document DO NOT describe the overwhelming evidence of NO relationship [relative risk (RR) = 1.00] between PM2.5 and total mortality in California. The weighted average of the most recent results from six different California cohorts show RR = 0.999 (0.988-1.010), which means there are NO premature deaths caused by PM2.5 in California. An appended table shows this null California evidence. This table, which is page 5 of my August 15, 2016 comments, was deliberately omitted from your Responses document.
3. Appendix I and your Responses document completely ignore this statement in my August 15, 2016 comments: “I have now submitted for publication a manuscript with null findings that invalidate the positive nationwide relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality published in the seminal Pope 1995 paper, which is based on the American Cancer Society Cancer Prevention Study II (CPS II) cohort. My null CPS II cohort findings raise serious doubts about validity of the positive CPS II cohort findings in Jerrett 2005, Jerrett 2009, and Jerrett 2013, which have been used as the basis for the PM2.5 premature death claims in the PPTs of Drs. Oliver and Shen.” My manuscript, entitled “Fine Particulate Matter and Total Mortality in Cancer Prevention Study II Reanalysis,” is now in press in a PubMed recognized scientific journal and should appear online in February 2017. This paper provides important new evidence that PM2.5 does not cause premature deaths anywhere in the United States, including California.

4. Appendix I and the [2016 AQMP SES Report](#) rely heavily on the PM2.5-mortality publications by Dr. Michael Jerrett and his co-authors. You have co-authored with Jerrett seven air pollution related publications during 2011-2016. This co-authorship raises serious doubts about your objectivity, particularly since you have ignored null PM2.5-mortality results and have ignored my challenges to the validity of the Jerrett publications. On November 11, 2016 I made a [US Office of Research Integrity allegation](#) that Jerrett 2013 falsified and exaggerated the relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in California. An ORI Investigator agreed that the Jerrett 2013 results “do not provide evidence that air pollution is directly responsible for mortality.” My US ORI allegation and a table showing NO PM2.5-mortality relationship in California are appended.

5. Appendix I does not describe the ACTUAL human exposures to PM2.5, ozone, and NOx in the SCAB. The human exposures to these pollutants are much lower than the ambient levels recorded at SCAQMD monitors and the average human exposures are well below the level of measurable health effects for these air pollutants. SCAQMD Board Members and SCAB residents must be informed of their actual exposures to pollutants. Furthermore, they must be informed that these levels are well below the corresponding US EPA NAAQS.

6. Appendix I provides no context regarding the impact of air pollution and other risk factors on the overall health of SCAB residents. An appended table shows low 2014 age-adjusted death rates from all causes, all cancer, and all respiratory disease in California and the SCAB. These death rates are among the lowest in the United States and the World. This table, which is page 6 of my August 15, 2016 comments, was deliberately omitted from your Responses document.

If the 2016 AQMP is approved by the SCAQMD Board on February 3, 2017, I will make a strong case to the new US EPA Administrator, the US House Science Committee, the US House Energy Committee, and the US Senate Environment Committee that the AQMP should not be implemented because it is NOT justified on a scientific or public health basis. Also, I will make a strong case to business and taxpayer groups in Southern California that the 2016 AQMP is scientifically unjustified and should not be funded. Many concerned scientists like myself are doing everything we can to stop SCAQMD from implementing new unjustified environmental regulations in Southern California, as part of a national effort to reduce unjustified regulations.

Finally, I am sending this email letter to all UCLA School of Public Health faculty members who have been involved with SCAQMD and/or with your 2011 Ph.D. in Epidemiology. I request that these faculty members assess my above comments and inform SCAQMD whether they believe the 2016 AQMP is justified on a public health basis. These faculty members are directly responsible for your training as an environmental epidemiologist and you, as a prominent public health official, are a direct reflection of the values and integrity of the School of Public Health.

Thank you for taking this message seriously, because it is a VERY SERIOUS message.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, Ph.D., M.P.H.

UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute

<http://climateconferences.heartland.org/james-enstrom-iccc10-panel-8/>

<http://climateconferences.heartland.org/iccc-12/>

jenstrom@ucla.edu