

August 3, 2014

The Honorable Rick Scott, Governor
State of Florida
The Capitol
400 S. Monroe St.
Tallahassee, Florida

Dear Governor Scott,

Allow me to introduce myself. I am a former Director of the National Hurricane Center (1974-1987) and former Chief Meteorologist of KHOU-TV Houston (1987-2008), and remain an avid and active climate scientist.

It has come to my attention that the Rev. Mitchell Hescoc, President of the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN), strongly encouraged you to support the anthropogenic climate change movement (man-made global warming) because it was a “pro-life” issue. Nothing could be further from the truth. The “pro-life” controversy is one of the most important moral challenges in the history of this great nation. On the contrary, man-made global warming is based on a very controversial debate that has not been settled. Unfortunately, the science of the debate has been high jacked by those seeking a political and profit advantage.

Rev. Hescoc goes on to use one of the “talking points” of those supporting man-made global warming, implying Florida will experience more “extreme weather.” Granted Florida’s experience with extreme weather, he must mean hurricanes.

Just the opposite is happening. Dr. Ryan Maue at Florida State University has shown that there has been a global reduction in the number of cyclones, typhoons and hurricanes, and in their accumulated energy, over the last 30 years. In Florida it has been 8 years since the last major hurricane. As you know, it has not always been that way. Rev. Hescoc is probably not aware that Florida was hit by 6 major hurricanes from 1944-1950. It is difficult for me to visualize a more active hurricane period in the future.

In a brief letter it is impossible to summarize the science of the man-made global warming debate that has been documented in thousands of published papers and hundreds of books. But, an overview of the debate can be made with a few short statements.

First, it is extremely important to note the earth has been warming for the past 150 years. There are no climate deniers in the scientific “skeptic” community. The argument is, “What is causing the warming?” At the present time there are two possibilities: first, man, by the release of carbon dioxide through the burning of fossil fuels, or second, natural weather cycles that are not well understood.

All of the alarmist statements about global warming are based on numerical models *designed* to strongly emphasize carbon dioxide as one of the major controlling factors in the earth’s temperature. The temperature forecasts produced by these models, when run out for the next 100 years were stunning. Thus the conclusion, man is causing a disaster by burning fossil fuels. The only solution is to reduce carbon dioxide.

In 1998 a major surprise occurred. While carbon dioxide levels continued to accelerate upward, the earth stopped warming and there has been no warming for the past 16 years.

Recently, the models have been tested by a number of researchers. Not one of the models accurately forecast the change in the earth’s temperature that began in 1998. This suggests the models have over emphasized the importance of carbon dioxide. If this proves to be true, the whole foundation of the man-made warming argument crumbles, and the burning of fossil fuels may not have the negative impact as advertised.

Another possible explanation for the earth’s warming is nature cycles. We know the earth’s weather occurs in cycles. Ice ages are the longest cycle we are aware of, and they last around 100,000 years separated by a 10,000-year warm period. We have been in the current warm period for almost 12,000 years.

In the warm periods, there appears to be a 1000-1500 cycle. For example, it was warm 3000 years ago, 2000 years ago during the time of Christ and 1000 years

ago during the medieval warm period when they were farming in Greenland. None of these warm periods can be explained by carbon dioxide.

Today, 1000 years later, we are experiencing another warming as the earth recovers from the Little Ice Age of the 1600's-1700's. The recovery started in the early 1800's, well before the current carbon dioxide levels began to rise after World War I.

In summary, many "skeptics" are exploring the possibility of natural cycles explaining the earth's warming. The science is far from being settled.

Over the past 15 years, the U.S. has spent \$150 billion on global warming, and this year's budget calls for another \$18 billion. A lot of the money went into the development of "Green Energy." What do we have to show for this effort? Let me make two observations. First, we now have numerical models that cannot accurately predict the future temperature of the earth for even 15 years, or even retrodict it for the past 30 years; and, second, we have numerous failed "green energy" projects, including Solyndra, which went bankrupt after being subsidized by the government for a half billion dollars.

What if we had taken a portion of that money and applied it to the horrible living conditions in parts of Africa? Millions of lives would have been saved.

I would be happy to make contact with someone on your staff if you have questions about global warming.

Sincerely,

Neil Frank
Former Director,
National Hurricane Center, 1974-1987
Chief Meteorologist,
KHOU TV Houston (CBS) 1987-2008