



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF MISSION SUPPORT

Frank Tinker, Ph.D.  
P.O. Box 37162  
Tucson, AZ 85740

Dear Dr Tinker:

This letter is in response to your Request for Reconsideration (RFR), received by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on March 4, 2021, which was assigned RFR number 21001A for tracking purposes. Your RFR requests that the Agency reconsider its denial of your Request for Correction (RFC) 21001, in which you requested that “correction be made to all documents, electronic or paper based, published by the Agency, that includes the terms “Greenhouse Effect”, “Greenhouse Gas”, or any related concept. Such correction should address the fact that the Greenhouse Effect has been disproven or the document in question should be removed from public view and replaced with an accurate analysis of Earth’s surface temperature.”

In accordance with EPA’s Information Quality Guidelines (IQGs), a three-member executive panel met on May 5, 2021, to review your request and the information you provided. The panel determined that the original reasoning behind EPA’s denial of the RFC 21001 remains sound and leverages the best scientific judgement of the scientific community. The panel found that the RFC was inconsistent with the consensus of the EPA scientific community as well as the scientific community as represented by the major scientific assessments of the National Academy of Sciences, the US Global Change Research Program, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; that the hypothesis on which the RFC is based has not been peer reviewed or otherwise evaluated by independent scientists; and that the “superposition principle” is being applied to the Stefan-Boltzmann equation incorrectly. The panel considered the new arguments raised within the RFR and determined that they are similarly inconsistent with the broad consensus of the scientific community nor were these new arguments peer reviewed or independently evaluated.

The approach to the Stefan-Boltzmann equation used in the RFR assumed two boundary conditions for the system; however, the Stefan-Boltzmann equation is designed for use with an idealized blackbody which, by definition, only has a single boundary. The RFR discussed the Agency’s argument that a surface temperature of 288K would necessitate an outgoing flux of 390 W/m<sup>2</sup>, which is inconsistent with the system discussed in the RFC. But the RFR erroneously rejected the Agency’s argument with an irrelevant appeal to Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. Finally, the RFR continues to apply the superposition principle, which is only applicable to linear equations and not to the non-linear Stefan-

Boltzmann equation. The argument in the RFR that the system is in steady state is irrelevant to this incorrect application of the superposition principle.

Therefore, the panel determined that the Agency's use of the terms "greenhouse effect" and "greenhouse gas" is based on sound science that continues to meet rigorous information quality standards. As a result, EPA is denying your RFR.

EPA remains committed to the guidelines established by the Office of Management and Budget for maximizing the quality, integrity, objectivity, and reproducibility of information we disseminate to the public.

Thank you for your interest in EPA's information quality.

Sincerely,

**VAUGHN  
NOGA**

Digitally signed by  
VAUGHN NOGA  
Date: 2021.06.09  
11:51:28 -04'00'

Vaughn Noga, Chief Information Officer and  
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Environmental Information