

## Scott Smullen - NOAA Federal

---

**From:** Scott Smullen - NOAA Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, September 9, 2019 12:48 PM  
**To:** Borenstein, Seth  
**Cc:** julie.roberts@noaa.gov; christopher.vaccaro@noaa.gov; NOAA Communications; Susan Buchanan - NOAA Federal; Maureen O'Leary - NOAA Federal  
**Subject:** Re: AP still seeking comment on NOAA friday note & now McLean letter calling for scientific integrity investigation & Uccellini statements

Hi Seth ...

I can provide you with this. You can quote me. Thanks -Scott

"NOAA's policies on [scientific integrity](#) and [communications](#) are among the strongest in the federal government, and get high marks from third party observers. The agency's senior career leaders are free to express their opinions about matters of agency operations and science. The agency will not be providing further official comment, and will not speculate on internal reviews."

On Mon, Sep 9, 2019 at 12:01 PM Borenstein, Seth <[SBorenstein@ap.org](mailto:SBorenstein@ap.org)> wrote:

Dear NOAA communications team,

You've seen the letter from Craig McLean saying he will start a Scientific Integrity violation probe and calling the Friday note. You've seen the NWS director's email and heard what he said to the NWA.

Any comment? Or at least a no comment? Does NOAA consider a violation of its scientific integrity a serious issue or not that much to be worried about? McLean said the Friday note "was not based on science but on external factions including reputation and appearance, or simply put, political." Was it political? Why or why not? And who ordered and wrote it? Why is it anonymous?

And while we're at it, these pending questions have still gone unanswered or even unacknowledged.

Former NOAA chief Jane Lubchenco, former NWS chief Joe Friday, former hurricane center chief Bill Read and former NOAA operations chief David Titley have all criticized the Friday later afternoon noaa statement on Alabama and Dorian and the Birmingham office's tweet. They say it undermines both morale and NOAA credibility and could end up risking lives. They say it is politics over science. Any response? Was this the White House's idea or NOAA's? Who wrote the communication and why was it unsigned? And some of the statements about NOAA leadership \_ moral cowardice is what David Titley called \_ are pretty damning. Any response?

I really do want to convey your side of this, but can only do so if you respond. My phone is 202-641-9454. Hiding doesn't make the story go away you know.

Thank you.

Seth

Seth Borenstein

Science Writer

The Associated Press

On Twitter: @borenbears

202-641-9454

Mobile: 202-841-4530; Signal enabled for privacy; <https://freedom.press/news/signal-beginners/>

1100 13<sup>th</sup> St. NW Suite 500

Washington DC 20005-4051

AP News: <https://apnews.com/>

AP Science stories: <https://apnews.com/tag/apf-science>

AP Health stories: <https://apnews.com/tag/apf-Health>

AP Top News: <https://apnews.com/tag/apf-topnews>

AP Fact Checks: <https://apnews.com/APFactCheck>

AP Politics: <https://apnews.com/tag/apf-politics>

**Want to send news tips, documents, etc. securely and confidentially to AP?**

<https://www.ap.org/tips/> There are multiple ways to get information to us. If you want it to come to me personally, mention my name somewhere.

"There are only two forces that can carry light to all corners of the globe -- only two -- the sun in the heavens and The Associated Press down here."

- Mark Twain

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1500 and delete this email. Thank you.

--

Scott Smullen  
Deputy Director  
NOAA Communications  
202-482-1097 o / (b)(6) c