

## Acacia Squires

---

**From:** Acacia Squires  
**Sent:** Monday, September 9, 2019 3:07 PM  
**To:** Scott Smullen - NOAA Federal  
**Cc:** julie.roberts@noaa.gov; christopher.vaccaro@noaa.gov; Hodgkin, Mary Scott  
**Subject:** RE: Urgent NPR Request

Thank you, Scott. Very much.

Acacia Squires  
State Government Editor  
[asquires@npr.org](mailto:asquires@npr.org)  
202.513.2271  
[@acaciasquires](https://twitter.com/acaciasquires)

**From:** Scott Smullen - NOAA Federal <[scott.smullen@noaa.gov](mailto:scott.smullen@noaa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2019 3:06 PM  
**To:** Acacia Squires <[ASquires@npr.org](mailto:ASquires@npr.org)>  
**Cc:** julie.roberts@noaa.gov; christopher.vaccaro@noaa.gov; Hodgkin, Mary Scott <[maryscott@wbhm.org](mailto:maryscott@wbhm.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Urgent NPR Request

Acacia,

Yes, and Craig's email speaks for itself (below) and no further elaboration is needed. However, this statement (directly below) may be of some help. You can attribute it to 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."

**From:** Craig McLean - NOAA Federal <[craig.mclean@noaa.gov](mailto:craig.mclean@noaa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Hurricane Dorian and Exceptional Service  
**Date:** September 8, 2019 at 9:55:45 PM PDT

Dear Colleagues,

The fierce storm we know as Hurricane Dorian has concluded its ferocious path through the Bahamas and along the US East Coast. Many of you have contributed to the excellent science that has underpinned the forecasts and current understanding of storms such as this one, which accelerated quite rapidly in intensity. The storm also presented challenges in track which improved with enhanced observations. We know that our collective work, from the scientists in the aircraft penetrating the storm, to the scientists deploying the glider picket line, to the modelers and folks working the physics of the storms, across OAR and in our CI's, and across all NOAA Lines, we are working the problem in order to give the NWS forecasters the best tools we

possibly can to keep America and our neighbors safe. Thank you.

During the course of the storm, as I am sure you are aware, there were routine and exceptional expert forecasts, the best possible, issued by the NWS Forecasters. These are remarkable colleagues of ours, who receive our products, use them well, and provide the benefit of their own experience in announcing accurate forecasts accompanied by the distinction of all credible scientists -- they sign their work. As I'm sure you also know, there was a complex issue involving the President commenting on the path of the hurricane. The NWS Forecaster(s) corrected any public misunderstanding in an expert and timely way, as they should. There followed, last Friday, an unsigned press release from "NOAA" that inappropriately and incorrectly contradicted the NWS forecaster. My understanding is that this intervention to contradict the forecaster was not based on science but on external factors including reputation and appearance, or simply put, political. Our NOAA Scientific Integrity Policy and Code of Scientific Conduct make clear that all NOAA employees shall approach all scientific activities with honesty, objectively, and completely, without allegiance to individuals, organizations, or ideology. The content of this press release is very concerning as it compromises the ability of NOAA to convey life-saving information necessary to avoid substantial and specific danger to public health and safety. If the public cannot trust our information, or we debase our forecaster's warnings and products, that specific danger arises.

You know that the value of our science is in the complexity of our understanding, our ability to convey that understanding to a wide audience of users of this information, and to establish and sustain the public trust in the truth and legitimacy of that information. Unfortunately, the press release of last Friday violated this trust and violated NOAA's policies of scientific integrity. In my role as Assistant Administrator for Research, and as I continue to administratively serve as Acting Chief Scientist, I am pursuing the potential violations of our NOAA Administrative Order on Scientific Integrity. Thankfully, we have such policies that are independently cited as among the best in the federal community, if not the best. Your NOAA and OAR management and leadership team believes in these policies and principles. I have a responsibility to pursue these truths. I will.

Thank you for your continued excellent work, and your trust. Carry on.

Craig

--

Craig N. McLean  
Assistant Administrator  
Oceanic and Atmospheric Research  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
U.S. Department of Commerce

On Mon, Sep 9, 2019 at 2:59 PM Acacia Squires <[ASquires@npr.org](mailto:ASquires@npr.org)> wrote:

Hello,

Our deadline is 3:30pm today.

We are will go live today on our afternoon news program with a story from the National Weather Association conference in Huntsville, Alabama.

Will you confirm that NOAA's acting chief scientist, Craig McLean, sent an email to colleagues indicating there will be an investigation into why NOAA leadership back President Trump over their own meteorologists on the path of Hurricane Dorian, as reported in the Washington Post today.

Can you confirm such an email was sent?

Thank you,  
Acacia Squires

Acacia Squires  
State Government Editor  
[asquires@npr.org](mailto:asquires@npr.org)  
202.513.2271  
[@acaciasquires](https://twitter.com/acaciasquires)

--

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