



[Majority Press Releases](#)

[Fact of the Day](#)

[Speeches](#)

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2005

# THE WEEKLY CLOSER

FROM THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE  
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 8

## THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Inhofe Briefs Majority Leader And Committee Chairmen On Katrina Response](#)
- [Inhofe Cautions Stock Exchange Not To Capitulate To Eco-Terror Threats](#)
- [Inhofe Applauds Senate Passage Of Conservation Legislation](#)

## IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [Greens vs. Levees \(National Review Online, September 8, 2005\)](#)
- [Hurricanes Aren't Caused by Global Warming but Political Hot Air Is \(Human Events Online, September 9, 2005\)](#)
- [Discover Dialogue: Meteorologist William Gray \(Discover Magazine, September 2005\)](#)

## QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

*“Everyone is clear global warming did not cause Katrina and that it is not causing more hurricanes. The worldwide rate has held pretty steady at 90 a year for decades, says Kerry Emanuel, professor of atmospheric science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.”*

(Elizabeth Weise, “What led to Katrina? Jury still out on global warming,” *USA Today*, 9/6/2005)

## INHOFE BRIEFS MAJORITY LEADER AND COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN ON KATRINA RESPONSE

**As Gulf Coast Situation Stabilizes, EPW Committee Will Engage in Oversight and Consider Potential Legislative Remedies to Remaining Issues**

As federal authorities continue their search and rescue efforts, the Senate Environment & Public Works (EPW) Committee will begin to consider what could potentially be described as the most catastrophic environmental disaster in American history. Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Chairman of the EPW Committee, briefed Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) and other Senate committee chairmen Wednesday on the actions the EPW Committee will be taking and overseeing over the next several months.

“Additional legislation may be required to remedy some of the issues we’re facing in the Gulf States and also to hold in check the potential for trickle down effects on the rest of the country,” Senator Inhofe said before entering the chairmen’s meeting. “Most importantly, we also want to ensure that authorities have what they need to facilitate ongoing search and rescue activities in the area.”

Chairman Inhofe briefed the Majority Leader and fellow committee chairmen on the following topics (by agency of EPW jurisdiction):

### Army Corps of Engineers

- Ongoing pumping of water in four areas (estimated timing based on current capacity/no rain)

- downtown (French Quarter – Garden District) – 24 Days
- Inner Harbor Canal – 36 Days
- St. Bernard Parish – North and South – 80 Days

➤ Repair/reconstruction of the levee

- An investigation will be conducted by Mississippi River Commission as to the design and construction of the levee and why it was breached.
- The EPW Committee will conduct oversight of this investigation.

➤ Debris removal

➤ Navigation

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)**

➤ Repair and reconstruction of highways

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

➤ Clean up (ensuring there is clean water; removal of hazardous debris)

➤ Ensure property is safe for reoccupation (addressing mold, mildew and indoor air quality)

➤ Extension of fuel waivers

**Economic Development Administration (EDA)**

➤ Will play a vital role in the redevelopment of the impacted areas

**General Services Administration (GSA)**

➤ Will be responsible for the reconstruction and/or replacement of federal buildings

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***INHOFE CAUTIONS STOCK EXCHANGE NOT TO CAPITULATE TO ECO-TERROR THREATS***

### **The New York Stock Exchange's Decision to Postpone Corporate Listing Would Set a Dangerous Precedent for Both Future and Current Listings**

Upon learning Wednesday of the New York Stock Exchange's (NYSE) decision to postpone its listing of Life Sciences Research, Inc. (LSR) due to threats of eco-terror, Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Chairman of the

Environment and Public Works Committee, cautioned NYSE chairman John Thain and president Catherine Kinney not to capitulate to the demands of environmental extremists.

“It seems to me unimaginable that this country’s worldwide symbol of the integrity of the capital markets, the NYSE, would capitulate to threats, or even the mere threat of threats, from a single issue extremist group,” Senator Inhofe wrote in a letter to NYSE officials. “Indeed, I trust the NYSE will duly consider the potentially disastrous precedential effect of a decision not to list LSR. What happens then to the other companies in the same business as LSR that currently trade on the NYSE? Would you not expect activists to pressure the NYSE to delist those companies? Does this expose the NYSE to further pressure from groups opposed to a wide variety of activities and businesses conducted by NYSE listed companies, from defense, to tobacco, to firearms, to spirits? LSR could truly represent the proverbial tip of the iceberg.”

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is conducting an investigation into eco-terrorism involving environmental and animal rights extremists. In May 2005 the Committee held its first on criminally based activism and plans further hearings specifically examining the campaign against LSR and its operating subsidiary, Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS), by Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC). SHAC has threatened the lives of corporate executives. A news report regarding the NYSE decision quoted SHAC spokesman Greg Avery as saying “It’s another humiliating slap in the face for HLS.” Avery was convicted in 2000 of threatening to murder an HLS executive.

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***INHOFE APPLAUDS SENATE PASSAGE OF CONSERVATION LEGISLATION***

### ***Senate Unanimously Approves Reauthorization of Junior Duck Stamp, Wildlife Restoration, and Great Ape Conservation Programs***

Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Chairman of the Environment & Public Works Committee, today hailed the Senate’s unanimous passage of four important conservation bills including the Junior Duck Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2005, reauthorization of the Great Ape Conservation and Wildlife Restoration programs, and technical corrections to the Lacey Act.

**“I am pleased the Senate today unanimously passed these four important conservation bills,”** Inhofe said, **“The provisions in these bills will extend and maintain these great, successful programs, further enhancing our conservation efforts in the U.S. and around the world.”**

The four conservation bills approved by the Senate today are:

- **S. 1339, Junior Duck Stamp Reauthorization (Inhofe):**

Reauthorizes the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994 through FY2010. The Junior Duck Stamp program is administered by state and regional coordinators from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, state resource agencies, and nonprofit conservation organizations.

- **S. 1340, Wildlife Restoration Reauthorization (Inhofe):** Extends authority under current law to direct interest accrued from the Pittman-Robertson Federal-Aid in Wildlife Restoration fund to be spent on projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA). Interest earned under this account has been eligible for these types of projects since NAWCA was enacted in 1989. However, if not reauthorized, this authority would expire on September 30, 2005.
- **S. 1250, Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization (Jeffords):** Reauthorizes the Great Ape Conservation Fund, which receives its annual appropriation through the Multinational Species Conservation Fund, for five years and authorizes \$5 million for 2006 and 2007 and \$7 million for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.
- **S. 1415, Lacey Act technical corrections (Inhofe):** Makes technical corrections to the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 and the Captive Wildlife Safety Act (CWSA) to ensure that the CWSA provisions found in 16 U.S.C 3372 are fully enforceable.

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...***

### **National Review Online**

September 8, 2005

### **Greens vs. Levees**

*Destructive river-management philosophy.*

By John Berlau

With all that has happened in the state, it's understandable that the Louisiana chapter of the Sierra Club may not have updated its website. But when its members get around to it, they may want to change the wording of one item in particular. The [site](#) brags that the group is "working to keep the Atchafalaya Basin," which adjoins the Mississippi River not far from New Orleans, "wet and wild."

These words may seem especially inappropriate after the breaking of the levee that caused the tragic events in New Orleans last week. But "wet and wild" has a larger significance in light of those events, and so does the group using the phrase. The national Sierra Club was one of several environmental groups who

sued the Army Corps of Engineers to stop a 1996 plan to raise and fortify Mississippi River levees.

The Army Corps was planning to upgrade 303 miles of levees along the river in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas. This was needed, a Corps spokesman told the Baton Rouge, La., newspaper *The Advocate*, because “a failure could wreak catastrophic consequences on Louisiana and Mississippi which the states would be decades in overcoming, if they overcame them at all.”

But a suit filed by environmental groups at the U.S. District Court in New Orleans claimed the Corps had not looked at “the impact on bottomland hardwood wetlands.” The lawsuit stated, “Bottomland hardwood forests must be protected and restored if the Louisiana black bear is to survive as a species, and if we are to ensure continued support for source population of all birds breeding in the lower Mississippi River valley.” In addition to the Sierra Club, other parties to the suit were the group American Rivers, the Mississippi River Basin Alliance, and the Louisiana, Arkansas and Mississippi Wildlife Federations.

The lawsuit was settled in 1997 with the Corps agreeing to hold off on some work while doing an additional two-year environmental impact study. Whether this delay directly affected the levees that broke in New Orleans is difficult to ascertain.

But it is just one illustration of a destructive river-management philosophy that took hold in the '90s, influenced the Clinton administration, and had serious policy consequences. Put simply, it's impossible to understand the delays in building levees without being aware of the opposition of the environmental groups to dams, levees, and anything that interfered with the “natural” river flow. ...

So far the environmental movement's role in the events leading to the flooding has been little discussed. One exception is former Rep. Bob Livingston (R., La.), who told Fox News on Saturday that environmentalists were one of the major reasons levee projects were held up.

At this point, there are still questions about the particular levees that broke in New Orleans. Care should be taken about drawing direct conclusions about the causes until there are more facts. But there are some important points that are clear that should put in perspective about levee funding and flood control.

**Nearly all flood-control projects — even relatively small ones — are subject to a variety of assessments for effects on wetlands, endangered species, and other environmental concerns.** These reviews can be costly and delay projects by years. In the '90s, for instance, the Clinton administration's Environmental Protection Agency required a comprehensive environmental impact statement just to repair [a few Colorado River levees that had been destroyed in the floods of 1993.](#)

**The Clinton administration would frequently side with environmentalists on flood-control projects, even against local Democrats.** The Army Corps of Engineers under Clinton began

implementing a planned “spring rise” of the Missouri River that would raise water levels on the Missouri River during part of the year. This was supported by eco-groups, who argued that this restored the river’s natural flows and protected a bird called the piping plover. But farm groups and others said that combined with the ice melting from winter, the project could increase the risk of flooding in river communities and affect more than 1 million acres of productive farmland. Nearly all the Republicans and Democrats in Missouri’s congressional delegation opposed the plan, as did Missouri’s late Democratic governor, Mel Carnahan. But the Clinton administration refused to budge, and this was a major factor in Bush’s carrying of Missouri in 2000. ...

Ironically, among those criticizing Bush for his actions to prevent flooding of the Missouri River was the ever-present anti-Bush environmental activist Robert F. Kennedy Jr. He chastised Bush in 2004 for “managing the flow of the Missouri River.” If, before Katrina, Bush had proceeded full-speed ahead and fortified the levees of the Mississippi for a Category 5 hurricane, Kennedy and others of his ilk would very likely have criticized Bush for trying to manage the natural flow of the Mississippi. And it’s a good bet that many of the lefty bloggers now critical of Bush for not reinforcing the levees would have cited Bush’s levee fortification as another way he was despoiling the natural environment.

**Click [here](#) for the full text of the article.**

[Return to the top](#) 

## Human Events Online

Posted Sep 9, 2005

### Hurricanes Aren’t Caused by Global Warming but Political Hot Air Is

by H. Sterling Burnett

...Environmental alarmists have long argued that human-caused global warming is causing more more intense hurricanes and that this danger will only grow in the future absent a severe energy diet. Picking up on that theme, Kennedy, Tritten and Kerry among others are now claiming that because the Bush administration has not enacted policies like the Kyoto protocol – the international treaty for the reduction of greenhouse gasses – to restrict domestic energy use, it is partly to blame for the both the current crisis in the gulf coast and for all future storm related tragedies. Their arguments are flawed and, shamefully, they know it.

There is scant, if any, evidence linking human-caused warming to the frequency or ferocity of hurricanes.

At the 27th annual National Hurricane Conference University of Colorado atmospheric scientist, Dr. William Gray, explained that nature is responsible for hurricane cycles, not humans. Periodically changing ocean circulation

patterns, he explained, led to the cycle of increasing hurricane activity that the world is currently experiencing. 2004's above average hurricane season was part of a completely natural and normal cycle that scientists have monitored for more than 100 years. In fact, for about the past 25 years there has been a relative lull in hurricane activity in the U.S.

We have recently begun to emerge from that cycle into a more active cycle of hurricane activity like those from the 1930s through 1950s. Indeed, according to the National Hurricane Center, category 3,4 and 5 hurricane numbers peaked in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s with an average of 9 per decade. In the 1940's alone, 23 hurricanes hit the U.S. mainland, 8 were category-3 or stronger storms. By contrast, since the 1980s when environmentalists first began to argue that humans were causing catastrophic climate change, the number of category 3 or higher hurricanes have averaged 5 per decade. ...

Politics has already affected global warming research. In a publicly released "Dear Colleague" letter, Chris Landsea of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration resigned as an IPCC researcher. He felt – his words – that in his area of expertise, climate and hurricanes, the IPCC had become too politicized. In particular he cited a 2004 press conference at Harvard University – held at the height of 2004's extremely busy hurricane season -- by Kevin Trenberth, an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scientist, during which Trenberth linked the outbreak of intense hurricane activity to global warming.

Landsea noted that none of the speakers at the Harvard conference cited any new research in the field to support their claims. He could have gone on to point out that Trenberth's claims contradicted the IPCC's own findings that, "Changes in [hurricane] intensity and frequency are dominated by inter-decadal to multi-decadal variations, with no significant trends over the twentieth century evident."

Hurricanes are costly and often deadly natural phenomena. Scientists and coastal residents have enough to worry about without irresponsible politicians making unsupported claims linking federal global warming policies and the severity of hurricanes. Global warming alarmists should be ashamed of themselves for preying on peoples' fears, and diverting attention from the real causes -- both political and natural – for the breadth of the devastation wrought by Katrina. The victims of this tragedy deserve better.

**Click [here](#) for the full text of the article.**

[Return to the top](#) 

**Discover**

September 2005

**Discover Dialogue: Meteorologist William Gray**

By Kathy A. Svitil

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. ...

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

[Gray]: 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.

**Click [here](#) for the full text of the article.**

---

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director  
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary