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Today’s session
Budget Control Act of 2011

- Raises the debt ceiling enough to continue borrowing until the end of 2011.
- Sets a discretionary spending cap in FY 2012 at $1.043 trillion, $24 billion higher than the current House budget resolution, nearly flat with FY 2011.
  - Caps discretionary spending at $1.234 trillion by FY 2021, saving $917 billion over that 10 year period.
- “Super Committee” tasked with finding $1.2 trillion in additional cuts.
  - Everything on the table, including discretionary funding.
  - If the committee fails to come to agreement, an across-the-board cut of up to $1.2 trillion will be made to both security and non-security programs starting in FY 2013.
- The University/Research Community’s message:
  - Long-term entitlement/tax reform
  - Stave off additional cuts to discretionary pot of money
Super Committee Timeline

- **August 16** – Members appointed (3D/3R from Senate, 3D/3R from House).
- **September 13** – First meeting.
- **October 14** – Each House and Senate committee may send recommendations to Super Committee on how to reduce the deficit.
- **November 23** – Super Committee votes on (1) report detailing findings, conclusions, recommendations, and CBO estimate, and (2) proposed legislative language.
- **December 2** – If approved, Super Committee submits report and language to President, VP, House, and Senate; introduction in House and Senate.
- **December 9** – House and Senate committees with jurisdiction report out bill without amendment (or auto-discharged).
- **December 23** – Votes in House and Senate.
- **January 31, 2012** – Super Committee terminates.
Super Committee: What does it mean for research funding?

- **FY 2011**
  - Not affected by debt deal.
  - Final CR enacted 6 months into fiscal year.
  - Science agencies cut between 1% and 3% - not as bad as it could have been.
  - Agency Operating Plans being finalized/implemented.

- **FY 2012**
  - Process *should* be easier now that top line caps are set.
  - CR to be enacted until Nov. 18.
  - Omnibus is most likely endgame strategy, could be completed by end of 2011, maybe before Thanksgiving; subcommittees are pre-conferencing.
  - Can’t raid non-defense programs for defense funding and vice versa.

- **FY 2013**
  - Planning underway by agencies, but timing is an issue.
  - Likely see a more conservative request from the President and/or request may be delayed.
  - Smaller proposed increases for science agencies.
Science funding at the moment—FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(In billions)</th>
<th>FY 2011 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2012 Request</th>
<th>FY 2012 House (+/- FY11)</th>
<th>FY 2012 Senate (+/- FY11)</th>
<th>Senate vs. House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>6.86 (flat)</td>
<td>6.69 (-2%)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;RA</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.60 (+0.8%)</td>
<td>5.44 (-2%)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>16.81 (-9%)</td>
<td>17.94 (-3%)</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.50 (-9%)</td>
<td>5.10 (+3%)</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4.49 (-2%)</td>
<td>5.02 (+9%)</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR*</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.289 (-32%)</td>
<td>.363 (-15%)</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clim. Service*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.162 (+100%)</td>
<td>+100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWS</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.908 (+4%)</td>
<td>.893 (+2.5%)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESDIS/NESS†</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.60 (+27%)</td>
<td>1.71 (+36%)</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPSS</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.901 (+91%)</td>
<td>.921 (+95%)</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOES-R</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.567 (-14%)</td>
<td>.617 (-7%)</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSMIC-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>24.74 (-3%)</td>
<td>25.55 (-0.2%)</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.80 (-0.9%)</td>
<td>4.83 (-0.2%)</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.547 (-11%)</td>
<td>.622 (+2%)</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects discrepancies re: Climate Service approval
† Reflects name change
Notable Deliberations/Sticking Points

• NSF – House (Chairman Wolf) is very supportive of NSF and increased the research budget, Senate (Chairwoman Mikulski and RM Hutchison) favors NASA/NOAA.

• NASA – James Webb Telescope, Earth science funding.

• NOAA – How to fund JPSS, Climate Service reorganization, future of NOAA research.

• DOE – Yucca Mountain, EERE (ravaged in House, protected in Senate), BER/climate research.
# Weather & Climate Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane Research</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Ocean Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Carbon and Aerosol Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA Organic Act</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Windstorm Impact Reduction Reauthorization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Supporting Weather, Climate Observations and Research</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did this happen?

• “Climate Whiplash” in 2009
  – Push for cap and trade, but no real leadership to see it through.
  – Unpopular process for creating NOAA Climate Service.
  – Climategate and IPCC inaccuracies call science into question.

• The good news:
  – Climate change is now in the lexicon of the public and policymakers, even if its not part of their daily lives or if agreement cannot be reached on causes/solutions.
  – Recent severe weather events keep climate science/scientists relevant.
  – There are cracks in some Members’ refusal of climate change – say publicly they don’t believe but then request information relative to their states or regions.

• Go local:
  – Find out what issues are important locally and take that message nationally.
  – Interact with your local policy makers and resource managers to learn what information they need, where the gaps are, etc.
Thank you!

Questions?
Notable Deliberations/Sticking Points

Senate CJS Report on NOAA Climate Service and OAR:

“…the FY 2012 request for NOAA’s new Climate Service was made at the expense of substantial funding from OAR’s climate research activities. The Committee does not see the value of having a research line office if research activities are requested elsewhere in the agency. In addition, the proposed reorganization of NOAA to create the Climate Service presented a unique opportunity to migrate research-related activities that exist in other NOAA line offices into OAR. However, such a consolidation was not proposed.”

“… NOAA needs to make a decision about the future of research within the agency. The Committee directs NOAA to include in its fiscal year 2013 request either a more realistic and viable justification for OAR, or to propose to eliminate basic research from NOAA’s portfolio and incorporate OAR’s applied research functions into their respective line offices.”
Notable Deliberations/Sticking Points

Senate CJS Report on JPSS:

“NOAA shall establish a compensation policy that requires the agency to be fully reimbursed by appropriate Federal agencies or scientific institutions for the use of JPSS data, information and products. The Committee takes note of various agencies and institutions that have commented on the importance of JPSS and weather forecasting to their own operations and how full funding for the program is needed regardless of current fiscal constraints. The Committee also notes that none of these entities have offered any financial support for such an important program. “

“… NOAA is prohibited from using appropriations to fund the development of any JPSS-related weather or climate instrument to fly on any satellite outside of the JPSS program without the express consent of the Committee.”

“… NOAA is directed to keep weather forecasting as the prime objective of the JPSS mission, and to minimize risk. To this end, any associated climate sensors that become the critical path for JPSS will be cancelled. Given the fiscal environment and JPSS’s low tolerance for risk, NOAA shall explore the feasibility of using smaller platforms to accommodate climate sensors in order to accomplish NOAA’s climate goals.”
## 2012 GOP Hopefuls on Environment/Science Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position on Climate Change</th>
<th>Position on Environmental/Science Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mitt Romney               | • Recently broken with GOP ranks to declare climate change is a threat and merits action to curb GHG.  
| Former Governor of Massachusetts | • Has publicly questioned climate science, but advocates for pro-climate initiatives and their economic benefits. | • Supports investments in technologies related to power generation, nanotechnology, and materials science.  
|                           |                                                                                             | • Would focus educational efforts in fields like math and science.                                      |
| Rick Perry                | • “I think there are a substantial number of scientists who have manipulated data so that they will have dollars rolling into their projects. [S]cientists [are] coming forward and questioning the original idea that man-made global warming is what is causing the climate to change.” | • NASA and its space program are important to Perry.  
| Governor of Texas         |                                                                                             | • Rigorously uses social science methods in his campaign.  
|                           |                                                                                             | • Wants a moratorium on all federal environmental regulation. Says it should be left to the states.     |
# 2012 GOP Hopefuls on Environment/Science Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position on Climate Change</th>
<th>Position on Environmental/Science Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jon Huntsman  
Former Governor of Utah & Ambassador to China | • Believes carbon emissions are altering Earth’s climate.  
• Created a Blue Ribbon Climate Change Advisory Panel in 2006, but ultimately it was unraveled. | • “We, as Republicans can’t shy away from speaking the word ‘environment.’”  
• Supports technology innovation. |
| Newt Gingrich  
Former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives | • Previously suggested that “our country must take action on climate change.” Appeared in a 2009 commercial with Pelosi re: action on climate change.  
• More recently, has said the push to address climate change is “the newest excuse to take control of lives” by “left-wing intellectuals.” | • Believes encouraging STEM education is a national security issue.  
• Suggests replacing EPA with an “Environmental Solutions Agency” which would achieve better outcomes while considering the impact of environmental policies on job creation and energy costs. |
| Michele Bachmann  
Congresswoman from Minnesota | • Has a narrow focus on social issues and hasn’t paid much attention to environmental matters.  
• Best known for rhetoric on climate change as a “hoax” and “hokum.” | • “I don't think it’s a good idea for government to come down on one side of scientific issue or another, when there is reasonable doubt on both sides.” |
What Happened to Climate Science?

• Two years ago, a lot of opportunities to talk about climate science, Democrats leading both houses, but still no major federal action.

• Today, little/no opportunities to discuss climate science in this Congress, split leadership in House and Senate, and still no major federal action.
  – Hearings include economists, business people, climate deniers.
  – In past Congresses, scientists were called to defend their science, but at least they were invited to participate.

• Debate has moved away from climate science and toward the “political motivations” behind funding climate programs.
  – Lubchenco accused of breaking the law re: NOAA’s climate activities; House Science Committee investigating.
  – Proposed Climate Services dubbed “political propaganda.”

• GOP debates have become the only place for discussions about climate science.