

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2005-0336-F

FOIA Number:
2005-0336-F

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Global Climate Change Files

OA/ID Number: 62054
Folder ID Number: 62054-003

Folder Title:
Environment: Ozone Layer [1992]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
	0	0	0	0

Office of Science and Technology Policy
or to who it concerns:

I heard on T.V. that there's a new freon that depletes the Ozone layer less. From my Organic Chemistry learning that's a lie. The only difference is if the freon has less moles of the halogen element per molecule of freon coolant gas then in a ratio of the difference in old freon to new freon that the ozone depletion would be less.

To break a Carbon-Fluorine or Carbon-chlorine bond takes one Ozone molecule. The statement on T.V. that the new freon depletes the ozone ^{layer} 90% less is lying with statistics. Alternate cooling materials or machines are still needed.

Lying with false chemistry on T.V. looks bad to me.

Wesley Perkins
3071 Wabash
Fort Worth, TX 76109

other side , over

if the new freon has 2 chlorine
per molecule instead of 4 chlorine
per molecule then the damage
to the ozone layer per mole
of molecules ^{of freon} is 50% less except
that the damage by weight
would be about $\frac{36}{100} \times \frac{170}{170}$
40% less.

The focus is to entirely remove
halogen from coolant gases.

show NM

✓ hold

"Document Control"

TYPE: ACTION DOCUMENT NUMBER: 9200565
ORIGINATOR: 02 STATUS I DIRECTORATE STATUS

FROM: SINGER, S. Fred: SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT

TO: DR. D.A. BROMLEY

DATE OF
CORRESPONDENCE: 02/18/92

SUBJECT: HE IS WRITING DR. BROMLEY TO URGE HIM TO GIVE DUE
WEIGHT TO SCIENTIFIC VIEWS BEYOND THOSE THAT
RECOMMENDED THE ACCELERATED PHASE OUT OF CFC'S.

DIRECTORATE STAFF
ASSIGNED: ENVIRONMENT ASSIGNED:

ACTION STAFF
REQUIRED: FOR DAB'S SIGNATURE ACTION:

SENDER'S DUE DATE:
OSTP DUE DATE: 03/05/92 STAFF DUE DATE
DATE COMPLETED: DATE COMPLETED/DEPT: 12/7/92

COPIES TO: D. Allan Bromley

WHITE HOUSE TRACKING #: CONTACT PERSON:
REMARKS: PHONE: EXT:

OSTP RECEIVED: 02/21/92 DEPT RECEIVED:
FILE: P-ENVIRONMENT-OZONE LAYER
CENTRAL FILES:

BE



DEC - 7 1992
DAB did
not want
to respond to
this - close out

0565 A

SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT

RECEIVED

S. Fred Singer, Ph.D., Director

92 FEB 21 A10:52

February 18, 1992

OSTP
MAIL ROOM

Dr. D. Allan Bromley
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Bromley:

Dylan

Many atmospheric scientists are concerned about the accelerated phaseout of CFCs, announced last week by the White House, following a widely publicized NASA press release. In our view, the available scientific evidence does not support such hasty action.

We are not opposed to the phaseout of CFCs on a reasonable time schedule, provided that affordable and effective substitutes are available, which are safe for human health.

We urge, however, that you give due weight to scientific views beyond those that advised this action--not only for the case of CFCs but also for the more far-reaching issue of regulating the emissions of carbon dioxide.

The enclosed "Update" details, point by point, some of our scientific concerns regarding the ozone issue.

Together with my colleagues, I am fully prepared to defend these statements in any scientific forum. I would urge you to arrange such an opportunity, not only for the sake of science but also to protect the American public from the economic consequences of unneeded environmental action.

Yours sincerely,

Fred

S. Fred Singer

Atmospheric physicist, University of Virginia.

Formerly: Director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service; Deputy Assistant Administrator, EPA; Chief Scientist, DOT; Dean, School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences, University of Miami.

SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT

ISSUES UPDATE: STRATOSPHERIC OZONE

WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 19, 1992---The announcement on Feb. 3 that NASA researchers had observed a peak concentration of reactive chlorine in the northern stratosphere---and the subsequent move by the White House, just a few days later, to accelerate the phaseout of CFCs---has raised a number of concerns and questions among atmospheric scientists.

- The phrasing of the NASA press statement led many journalists to report ozone depletion or an ozone "hole" over the Arctic. In fact, no such claim was made; the statement only suggests the possibility, which is dependent upon unique meteorological conditions. Chlorine atoms cycle back and forth between reactive and inactive forms, depending on the presence of stratospheric ice particles, which in turn depend upon temperature.
- Principal project scientist James Anderson (in *Science News*, 2/8/92) could only vaguely predict the development of a "hole" during some year in the near future, perhaps in the "decade to come."
- The chlorine peak was observed on Jan. 20; presumably readings both before and after that date were lower. Without additional information, it is impossible to assess the significance of the peak nor to explain its occurrence. The announcement came well before the completion of the October to March suite of measurements.
- NASA reported similar high chlorine values in its last Arctic experiment in 1989. No polar ozone thinning developed at that time.
- It is impossible to tell the source of a chlorine atom; one looks pretty much like another. The NASA press release claimed that the chlorine came mainly from CFCs. No estimate was given of the contribution from Mount Pinatubo's volcanic eruptions, now producing a temporary ozone depletion over the tropics.
- For the past four years, the U.N. Ozone Trends Panel has been reporting a *global* depletion of ozone, with each report announcing a depletion that is more rapid and larger than expected. But natural variations of ozone are many times larger than the reported trends. In addition, two Belgian scientists, de Muer and de Bakker, have just published a startling paper in *The Journal of Geophysical Research*, pointing out that sulfur dioxide pollution interferes with ozone measurements. Correcting for changes in SO₂ **cancels the reported ozone depletion trend.**

MORE...

ISSUES UPDATE: STRATOSPHERIC OZONE--Page 2

- If claims of ozone depletion over North America were correct, scientists should have seen an increase in ultraviolet radiation at ground level. However, measurements to date show just the opposite, a *decrease* in ground level UV.
- Claims of huge increases in skin cancer, cataracts, or plankton death appear unsubstantiated. A 5 percent decrease in ozone, causing (theoretically) a 10 percent increase in surface UV, would be equivalent to moving 60 miles closer to the equator, roughly the distance from Washington to Richmond.
- Overlooked by the press was the fact that the research was partly supported by the chemical industry's Alternate Fluorocarbon Environmental Acceptability Study. These chemical companies produce and hope to sell CFC substitutes, as CFCs are phased out. According to Tony Vogelsberg of DuPont (as quoted in the *Wall Street Journal*, 2/13/92): "The customers haven't been buying the alternatives because they haven't felt pressured."

Many scientists have noted a disturbing trend in ozone research in recent years: for example, announcements of depletion trends are being made by press release, without the publication of peer-reviewed data and analyses.

In March 1988, NASA announced that *global* ozone depletion had been observed for the first time (quite apart from the temporary annual thinning observed over the Antarctic). The announcement was made at a press conference with a press release. To date the full study has yet to be published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

On October 23, 1991, the United Nations Environmental Program, based in Nairobi, claimed that an unnamed panel of "80 of the world's foremost atmospheric scientists" had concluded that the ozone layer was thinning even faster than predicted. Again, a press release, followed by an executive summary. Despite references in the press release, and in subsequent news accounts, to a "just-released 300-page report," the report has yet to be published.

The Feb. 3, 1992, NASA announcement was yet another instance of a press statement without full publication of data.

NWF Correction: In a Feb. 3 "Action Alert" to members of the National Wildlife Federation, NWF President Jay D. Hair refers to the "emissions of carbon dioxide and other ozone destroying gases." To avoid confusing ozone depletion with greenhouse warming, it must be noted that carbon dioxide, while a greenhouse gas, does *not* destroy ozone.

#

The Science & Environmental Policy Project is an independent research effort to study and document, through publications and symposia, the relationship between scientific data and the development of federal environmental policy. Directed by atmospheric physicist Dr. S. Fred Singer, the project is supported by grants from the Bradley, Smith Richardson, and Forbes Foundations.

"Document Control"

TYPE: ACTION

DOCUMENT NUMBER: 9200512

ORIGINATOR: 02

STATUS I

DIRECTORATE STATUS

FROM: MOFFAT, Lorna: CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

TO: DR. D.A. BROMLEY

DATE OF
CORRESPONDENCE: 02/08/92

SUBJECT: SHE IS WRITING TO OFFER SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF
OZONE DEPLETION DUE TO THE VENTING OF FREON BY AOUT
CENTERS. SHE ALSO ASKS DR. BROMLEY TO URGE THE
PRESIDENT TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF OZONE DEPLETION IN
A SPECIAL ADDRESS TO THE NATION.

DIRECTORATE

ASSIGNED: ENVIRONMENT

STAFF

ASSIGNED:

ACTION

REQUIRED: DIRECT REPLY

STAFF

ACTION:

SENDER'S DUE DATE:

OSTP DUE DATE: 03/05/92

STAFF DUE DATE

DATE COMPLETED:

DATE COMPLETED/DEPT:

COPIES TO: D. Allan Bromley

WHITE HOUSE TRACKING #:

CONTACT PERSON:

PHONE:

REMARKS: No response necessary per NY

(See DABS comments)

OSTP RECEIVED: 02/20/92

DEPT RECEIVED

FILE: P-ENVIRONMENT-OZONE LAYER

CENTRAL FILES:

I assumed no response! Don't
she think we care about her
memos!

2/21



1980-1981

Handwritten text, likely a signature or date, written diagonally across the bottom of the page.