

Information on Violations of Scientific Integrity at the U.S. National Park Service

Patrick Gonzalez, Ph.D.

Principal Climate Change Scientist, U.S. National Park Service
Associate Adjunct Professor, University of California, Berkeley

December 2, 2019

Introduction

This document summarizes information on three violations of scientific integrity of the U.S. National Park Service against me that occurred from February 12, 2018 to October 1, 2019. It also provides information indicating that the conclusion of Department of the Interior Inspector General report 18-0706 was erroneous. This document follows information submitted May 21, 2018, to the Department of the Interior Inspector General web site (Complaint OI-HQ-18-0769-G) and information provided by telephone August 31, 2018, to Interior Inspector General staff. It adds information on additional NPS actions after that telephone call.

I am a forest ecologist and climate change scientist <<http://www.patrickgonzalez.net>>. I serve as the Principal Climate Change Scientist of the U.S. National Park Service, a federal employee (GS-0401-14). I am also an Associate Adjunct Professor at the University of California, Berkeley, an academic appointment granted through a university review process (Document 2018-02-08 UC Berkeley re-appointment of Gonzalez). I write here as an individual, not for the U.S. Government.

I conduct scientific research on anthropogenic climate change, help resource managers apply the results to protect national parks, and communicate on climate change science to scientists, resource managers, and the public. I have published the only two comprehensive scientific analyses of anthropogenic climate change across all U.S. national parks (Gonzalez 2017, Gonzalez et al. 2018) and have published research with colleagues in *Science*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, and other journals.

I am also a lead author on four reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the organization that publishes the authoritative scientific assessments of anthropogenic climate change. IPCC reports comprise the standard scientific references informing global policies and actions. For this work, IPCC was awarded a share of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize.

Despite the high level and usefulness of my applied research for national parks, National Park Service (NPS) officials have attempted to suppress my scientific research and communications on human-caused climate change. I have stood up for scientific integrity and not changed a single word of what I write or say. I have continued to speak publicly, even testifying to the U.S. Congress. For my work, I have appreciated the strong support of the University of California, Berkeley.

While NPS has engaged in numerous violations of scientific integrity since early 2017, it is for three instances that I have the most solid written documentation, summarized in the text below and in attached documents:

1. NPS attempted to get me to delete text from my scientific journal manuscript but I refused. I published the journal article as I wrote it.
2. NPS attempted to delete scientific text from a staff person's technical report, so I removed my name as a co-author. NPS reprimanded me for stating my support for scientific integrity but NPS relented and

did not delete the scientific text. The Interior Inspector General report on the original incident was erroneous in claiming that the report was released unedited.

3. NPS issued a cease-and-desist letter trying to block me from conducting science work on the IPCC, from speaking to public media, and from speaking to the U.S. Congress under my UC Berkeley affiliation. I disregarded the letter as erroneous and continued to work on IPCC, continued to speak to the media, and spoke to the U.S. Congress a second time, under my UC Berkeley affiliation. For all this work, I used vacation time and personal funds.

The violations of scientific integrity involve NPS attempts to delete the scientific phrases “anthropogenic climate change” and “human-caused climate change” or to suppress the communication of the human cause of climate change. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2013) and the U.S. Global Change Research Program, the U.S. Government program with statutory responsibility for publishing the U.S. National Climate Assessment (USGCRP 2017), confirm the overwhelming scientific evidence and agreement of scientists on the human cause of climate change. So, the scientific basis of the terms is robust.

Concerning U.S. Government policy, the U.S. is a party to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which affirms the scientific findings of the human cause of climate change and seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from human activities. Also, the U.S. National Climate Assessment (USGCRP 2017), the official U.S. Government report on climate change, confirms the human cause. The NPS Climate Change Response Strategy <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/climatechange/upload/NPS_CCRS-508compliant.pdf>, which guides NPS work on climate change, also affirms the scientific findings of the human cause of climate change. So, the policy basis of the terms is solid. Furthermore, work on anthropogenic climate change helps fulfill the mission of NPS to conserve the national parks “unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations” (National Park Service Organic Act, 39 Stat. 535, August 25, 1916).

Because the scientific and policy bases for anthropogenic climate change are sound, attempts to delete or alter the term or related text are for non-science and non-policy reasons. Repeated attempts to delete or alter scientific content for non-science and non-policy reasons violated the policy on scientific integrity of the U.S. Department of the Interior (305 Department Manual 3.7.C.1):

“...will not engage in dishonesty, fraud, misrepresentation, coercive manipulation, censorship, or other misconduct that alters the content, veracity, or meaning or that may affect the planning, conduct, reporting, or use of scientific activities.”

<https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/elips/documents/305%20DM%203_%20INTEGRITY%20OF%20SCIENTIFIC%20AND%20SCHOLARLY%20ACTIVITIES.docx>

Actions by NPS officials against me are forms of “coercive manipulation” that “affect the planning, conduct, reporting, or use of scientific activities” by (1) preventing parts of my research and communications on anthropogenic climate change from occurring as part of my official duties and (2) diverting time from my substantive work conducting research and assisting parks to instead handling numerous telephone calls and meetings to defend my rights and writing replies to NPS. Consequently, I have needed to conduct core work on my own time and at my own expense. My publications and communications have, in the end, been published and broadcast unaltered. Yet, the coercive manipulation itself constitutes a violation by NPS of scientific integrity, regardless of the final disposition of my publications and communications.

Actions by NPS officials also contradict the statutory research mandate of the U.S. National Park Service (Public Law 105-392, section 202):

“The Secretary is authorized and directed to assure that management of units of the National Park System is enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information.”

<<https://www.congress.gov/105/plaws/publ391/PLAW-105publ391.pdf>>

IPCC and USGCRP provide the highest quality climate change science but NPS has acted against their utilization by denying their core scientific conclusion that people cause climate change.

1. NPS attempted to get me to delete text from my scientific journal manuscript but I refused. I published the journal article as I wrote it.

On February 12, 2018, I spoke in a telephone call with my supervisor, Cat Hawkins Hoffman. She is the NPS official with the authority to provide or withhold “administrative approval,” based on policy (not scientific content) before a manuscript can be published under my NPS affiliation. On our regular weekly telephone call, I asked her what she thought of the manuscript, which I had sent four days previously to inform her of the completion of the draft. She said that she had not yet looked at it. Just then, she opened up the pdf file that I had sent to her. The first sentence read:

“Anthropogenic climate change is altering ecological and human systems globally (IPCC 2013, 2014, USGCRP 2017) and in United States (U.S.) national parks (Gonzalez 2017).”

When she read the first sentence, without reading any more of the manuscript, she said “I’m going to have to ask you to change that.” She tried to get me to remove or alter the phrase “anthropogenic climate change” because she said that political appointees in the Department of the Interior would not like it and she wanted to avoid funding cuts to the National Park Service Climate Change Response Program. She tried for approximately an hour and a half. I told her that I would not change a single word of scientific content for non-science reasons (Document 2018-11-06 Gonzalez to NPS on violations).

I said to her that the IPCC and the USGCRP both confirm the overwhelming scientific evidence on the human cause of climate change (see above, Introduction). So, the scientific basis of the term anthropogenic climate change is robust. I also told her that the term also conforms to U.S. Government policy (see above, Introduction), through U.S. ratification of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, through USGRCP, and through the NPS Climate Change Response Strategy, which all affirm the scientific findings of the human cause of climate change. So, the policy basis of the terms is solid. I said to her that, because both the scientific and policy bases for anthropogenic climate change are sound, attempts to delete or alter the term or related text were for non-science and non-policy reasons. So, I maintained the original scientific text.

This timeline summarizes further actions on this matter:

February 13, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez telephone call with John Dennis, National Park Service Deputy Chief Scientist. John Dennis is the NPS official who had, in the past, been responsible for checking the policy, but not scientific, content of my scientific manuscripts as part of the process of gaining “administrative approval” before a manuscript could be published under my NPS affiliation. I informed him of what Cat Hawkins Hoffman said and that I considered it a violation of scientific integrity. He told me to compromise by changing the phrase “anthropogenic climate change.” I refused to change a single word for non-science reasons.

February 13-21, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez telephone calls with Sara Newman, NPS Scientific Integrity Officer (February 13); two colleagues in the NPS Pacific West Region (February 13); the President and the Secretary of Chapter 296, National Treasury Employees Union (February 14); and one colleague in the NPS Alaska Region (February 21). I informed them of what Cat Hawkins Hoffman said and that I considered it a violation of scientific integrity.

February-April, 2018 – In other telephone calls, Cat Hawkins Hoffman maintained her position that the phrase “anthropogenic climate change” should be deleted or altered and I continued to refuse. She said that John Dennis would, as usual, handle the policy review part of the National Park Service administrative review process.

March 20, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez completed editing of the manuscript in response to comments from co-authors.

March 20, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez sent the manuscript to John Dennis for the policy review part of NPS administrative review.

March 23, 2018 – John Dennis sent an e-mail with comments as annotations to the pdf file (Document 2018-03-23 NPS comments on Gonzalez manuscript). In the pdf file, where I had written “Anthropogenic climate change is altering ecological and human systems globally and in United States (U.S.) national parks”, John Dennis highlighted the word “Anthropogenic” and added a comment box that asked “...Is this word here necessary to the basic scientific thesis of the paper - which I interpret to be “climate change is revealed already to have had major impacts to parks”. An alternative phrase here could be “Carbon dioxide driven climate change ...”. Another alternative phrase could be “Rapid climate change ...” (Document 2018-03-23 NPS comment 1 on Gonzalez manuscript)

Later in the manuscript, John Dennis highlighted “anthropogenic” (climate change) and wrote “recently accelerated” (climate change) as a replacement (Document 2018-03-23 NPS comment 2 on Gonzalez manuscript).

In his e-mail he wrote “...from a policy standpoint, it might be too strong for a DOI person to say “anthropogenic climate change”. From the standpoint of a scientist who sees climate change from the viewpoint of the global climate change community, “anthropogenic climate change” might be the scientifically correct phrase and any attempt to force a change to that scientist's writing might result in a loss of scientific integrity.”

I refused to make any of those changes.

April 5, 2018 – John Dennis sent further comments to Patrick Gonzalez and Cat Hawkins Hoffman by e-mail. He wrote “In thinking about Patrick's article to estimate increase in park temperatures over the past 100 or so years, I several times have come back to the “why” question, which in the short hand is answered by the phrase “anthropogenic climate change” but in the long hand may better be approached through a different path.”

April 9, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez sent manuscript to Cat Hawkins Hoffman requesting National Park Service administrative approval.

April 11, 2018 – John Dennis sent further comments by e-mail, questioning the main conclusion of the manuscript. He wrote “I have been pondering the following statement in the abstract to your climate change in parks manuscript: Between 1895 and 2010, temperature of the national park area increased at double the U.S. rate. This statement seems counter-intuitive to me... A possible way to test these thoughts

might be to compare the increase in temperature of the pixel(s) containing a park to the increase in temperature of the surrounding pixels...”

April 13, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez replied to John Dennis by e-mail on April 11 message. I summarized for him the central analysis of the manuscript. “The comparison that you sketch out is very similar to what we did. The analysis for the US, however, was for the entire US, not just the parts of the US outside the parks. So, the area of greater temperature increase represented by the parks is included in the US. The difference between the parks and the US is statistically significant.”

April 20, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez replied to John Dennis by e-mail on March 23 message. I wrote “The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2013) and the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP 2017) both confirm the overwhelming scientific evidence and agreement of scientists on the human cause of climate change. Therefore, the scientific basis of the term is robust. I retain it and related text with no changes.”

April 30, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez telephone call with John Dennis. I spoke to him about his comments and my replies.

May 1, 2018 – John Dennis gave NPS policy approval.

May 1, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez sent manuscript to Cat Hawkins Hoffman again requesting NPS administrative approval.

May 6, 2018 – Cat Hawkins Hoffman gave NPS administrative approval.

May 7, 2018 – Patrick Gonzalez submitted manuscript to a scientific journal.

September 24, 2018 – The journal *Environmental Research Letters* published the scientific article (Gonzalez et al. 2018).

In the past, John Dennis had reviewed manuscripts and sent administrative approval within approximately a week. In the case of this manuscript, the attempts by Cat Hawkins Hoffman and John Dennis to get me to alter scientific content delayed administrative approval by approximately a month and resulted in many hours expended on telephone calls, e-mail messages, and other writing to defend scientific integrity.

2. NPS attempted to delete scientific text from a staff person’s technical report, so I removed my name as a co-author. NPS reprimanded me for stating my support for scientific integrity but NPS relented and did not delete the scientific text. The Interior Inspector General Report on the original incident was erroneous in claiming that the report was released unedited.

The attempted deletions of scientific text from an NPS technical report on sea level rise have been reported by the Center for Investigative Reporting on Reveal, public radio broadcast and web site:

“Wipeout: Human role in climate change removed from science report” April 2, 2018

<https://www.revealnews.org/article/wipeout-human-role-in-climate-change-removed-from-science-report>
(Shows NPS attempted edits to a Word document)

“Democrats ask Interior to investigate climate change edits” April 7, 2018

<https://www.revealnews.org/blog/democrats-ask-interior-to-investigate-climate-change-edits>

“Zinke grilled about edited science report” April 12, 2018
<https://www.revealnews.org/blog/zinke-grilled-about-edited-science-report>
(Shows NPS attempted edits to a Word document)

“National parks report on climate change finally released, uncensored” May 18, 2018
<https://www.revealnews.org/blog/national-parks-report-finally-released-uncensored>

The first author of the sea level rise report was Maria Caffrey, Ph.D., a non-permanent employee of the University of Colorado, assigned to an NPS office in Denver. I had assisted her and was honored when she invited me as a co-author of the report. I was the only NPS employee to defend her through the violations of scientific integrity revealed for the public by the Center for Investigative Reporting.

The violation of scientific integrity that was specifically directed at me is summarized in this timeline:

April 6, 2018 – NPS teleconference on the sea level rise report – In one particularly severe attempt to coerce Maria Caffrey to delete the phrase “anthropogenic climate change,” NPS manager Brendan Moynahan threatened to have NPS release the sea level rise report stripped of the names of the authors. This would, in effect, be publishing work without credit to the authors, clearly violating scientific integrity.

A University of Colorado official on that teleconference recounted the occurrence in an e-mail:

“What did surprise me a bit was Brendan’s ultimatum that if you all cannot reach agreement, NPS will proceed to publish the report without specific authors.” (Document 2018-04-06 U. Colorado message on NPS pressure)

I wrote:

“Because both the scientific and policy bases for anthropogenic climate change are sound, attempts to delete or alter the term or related text are for non-science and non-policy reasons. The repeated attempts over the past year to delete or alter scientific content or meaning for non-science and non-policy reasons and halting the report...possess characteristics of suppressing science that would apparently violate the policy on scientific integrity of the U.S. Department of the Interior.” (Document 2018-04-06 Gonzalez to NPS on scientific integrity)

April 11, 2018 – NPS sent three edited versions of the sea level rise report for report authors to consider. In one version, Brendan Moynahan had deleted “anthropogenic climate change” (Document 2018-04-11 NPS attempted deletion from sea level rise report).

April 18, 2018 – To dissociate my name from a report – the NPS sea level rise report – that had been subjected to repeated violations of scientific integrity, I removed my name as a co-author (Document 2018-04-18 Gonzalez removes name from NPS report).

May 18, 2018 – Following the series of articles by the Center for Investigative Reporting, NPS relented and released the report without the deletions of scientific content.

June 14, 2018 – NPS reprimanded me:

“...this is a letter of counsel to you, following our recent discussions of your e-mail messages... particularly those of April 6 and April 18”

“I must advise that any such further behavior will result in appropriate corrective action being taken.”
(Document 2018-06-14 NPS reprimand)

In the e-mail messages of April 6 (Document 2018-04-06 Gonzalez to NPS on scientific integrity) and April 18 (Document 2018-04-18 Gonzalez removes name from NPS report), I had stated the importance of scientific integrity and identified violations with the sea level rise report. In effect, NPS reprimanded me for standing up for scientific integrity.

Erroneous Interior Inspector General report

Interior Inspector General report 18-0706 said: “the report was published without edits”

<<https://www.doioig.gov/reports/alleged-scientific-integrity-violations-related-national-park-service-report>>

The report before April 18, 2018, listed my name on the title page as a co-author (Document 2017-03-20 Sea level report draft.pdf). The final report did not <<https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/DownloadFile/601560>>. The removal of my name as a co-author of the sea level rise report was a major edit. Therefore, Interior Inspector General report 18-0706 was erroneous.

May 21, 2018 – I submitted information to the Interior Office of Inspector General (Document 2018-05-21 Gonzalez to Interior Inspector General) but did not receive a reply.

June 19, 2018 – I left a telephone message with the Interior Office of Inspector General but received no reply.

June 29, 2018 – I sent an e-mail to the Interior Office of Inspector General (Document 2018-06-29 Gonzalez to Interior Inspector General) but received no reply.

August 16, 2018 – I sent an e-mail directly to Deputy Inspector General Mary Kendall (Document 2018-08-16 Gonzalez to Interior Inspector General).

August 24, 2018 – Deputy Inspector General Mary Kendall replied.

August 31, 2018 – I provided extensive information to Interior Inspector General staff member William Wisner in a long telephone call. He said he would take it to a committee that evaluated cases. I said I would send documentation. I received no Inspector General information on the status of the case.

December 2, 2019 – I send this document with associated documentation.

3. NPS issued a cease-and-desist letter trying to block me from conducting science work on the IPCC, from speaking to public media, and from speaking to the U.S. Congress under my UC Berkeley affiliation. I disregarded the letter as erroneous and continued to work on IPCC, to speak to the media, and spoke to the U.S. Congress a second time, under my UC Berkeley affiliation. For all this work, I used vacation time and personal funds.

Testimony to the U.S. Congress

In the first hour of the first day in January 2019 of the new 116th Congress, the House Natural Resources Committee sent me an invitation to testify on human-caused climate change in the U.S. national parks. I welcomed this opportunity to contribute my unique knowledge to advancing national policy. On the public

radio show Reveal, the Center for Investigative Reporting had shown, however, that National Park Service officials were trying to suppress communications on climate change science. If I testified, I would be defying the agency. I decided to stand for scientific integrity and testified to Congress, under my Berkeley affiliation.

A month later, on March 21, 2019, NPS sent a “cease-and-desist” letter (Document 2019-03-21 NPS cease-and-desist letter):

“On numerous occasions over the past few months you provided statements and interviews to various media outlets, as well as testimony to the United States Congress pertaining to your work under employment with the National Park Service (NPS)...you must immediately cease and desist from using or referring to your official duty assignment position as adjunct faculty at the University of California, Berkeley in any activities with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)...Any additional incidents of this nature may be cause to initiate appropriate disciplinary action.”

NPS claimed that my UC Berkeley appointment was a federal government duty. This was clearly erroneous. UC Berkeley granted an academic appointment to me as an individual. In effect, NPS was attempting to fabricate a technicality with the intent of intimidation to silence my scientific communications, my freedom of speech.

On April 22, 2019, I wrote a reply enumerating my legal rights and the correct status of my UC Berkeley appointment (Document 2019-04-22 Gonzalez reply to NPS cease and desist):

“Multiple statutory and regulatory provisions and NPS policies clearly support my right to communicate with Congress and the media and prohibit NPS from preventing me from exercising that right.”

That same day, Dean Emeritus J. Keith Gilless confirmed the independence of my UC Berkeley appointment: “The University granted him an appointment as an Associate Adjunct Professor for his individual merit through the same process used for faculty on the campus payroll. This academic appointment was been granted to him as an individual, independent of his position as a federal employee.” (Document 2019-04-22 UC Berkeley letter to NPS)

Another round of letters occurred a month later (Document 2019-05-22 NPS second letter, Document 2019-05-30 Gonzalez second reply to NPS). While NPS claimed that they were not trying to forbid my speech, their intent in issuing the cease-and-desist letter was clear – to attempt to intimidate me from speaking to the press and to Congress. Note that, since the first half of 2018, NPS was compelled by Freedom of Information Act requests to make public numerous e-mail messages on scientific integrity. So, by this time, NPS officials were aware that their communications, such as the second letter to me, could become public.

Members of Congress invited me to return to Washington, DC, and speak again. On June 20, 2019, I spoke to the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition <<https://twitter.com/SEEC/status/1142077420641669123>>. Contributing scientific knowledge for policies that provide solutions to global problems is one of the most important contributions that I can make as a scientist.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the organization that produces the authoritative scientific assessments of climate change (see above, Introduction). I have served as a lead author of IPCC reports in 2001, 2006, 2013, and a forthcoming report in 2021.

On November 21, 2016, I submitted a request to NPS to work on the new series of IPCC reports. NPS had previously supported my work and covered my travel costs for a 2013 IPCC report for which I served as a lead author. For the upcoming reports, however, my NPS supervisor Cat Hawkins Hoffman told me by telephone that she and NPS did not support my nomination to IPCC to serve as an author.

On September 16, 2017, I was nominated to IPCC under my UC Berkeley affiliation. On February 2, 2018, I was honored to be selected for the IPCC 2021 report as a lead author for the ecosystems chapter, the highest level for a climate change scientist working on ecosystems (Document 2018-02-02 IPCC Invitation to Gonzalez). UC Berkeley posted the news <https://news.berkeley.edu/story_jump/berkeley-ecologist-selected-as-a-lead-author-for-ipcc-report>.

On April 16, 2018, Cat Hawkins Hoffman told me by telephone that she and NPS Associate Director Ray Sauvejot did not approve of me working on IPCC as part of my federal duties. I verified this by my message to the Associate Director on April 17, 2019 (Document 2018-04-17 Gonzalez message to NPS on IPCC, Document 2018-04-17 Gonzalez summary of IPCC work).

NPS is not supporting its Principal Climate Change Scientist on the principal climate change science work in the world. Because NPS opposes my working on IPCC, I conduct IPCC work on my own time (at night, on weekends, taking vacation days) and pay all my own travel costs to IPCC work sessions. I work on IPCC under my University of California, Berkeley, affiliation.

Speaking to public media

From 2010 through 2016, NPS authorized me to speak directly to the media. To keep NPS informed of my contacts with the media, I copied the NPS Office of Communications on e-mail responses to journalists. In 2017, my supervisor and other NPS officials put approximately six layers of approval before I was authorized to speak to the media. This process delayed approval, sometimes for two or three days and past media deadlines, effectively denying approval. In one case, a *New York Times* reporter asked to interview me, but NPS never provided a final decision, in effect, denying the request.

The journal *Environmental Research Letters* set September 24, 2018, as the publication date of my scientific article. This was the first analysis of anthropogenic climate change trends across all 417 national parks, showing that national parks have been heating at twice the rate of the country as a whole, so it had the potential for gaining media interest. On September 4, 2018, I requested NPS approval to speak directly with public media when the article was published (Document 2018-09-04 Gonzalez to NPS media request). Cat Hawkins Hoffman told me by telephone said that she and other NPS officials denied the request.

UC Berkeley decided to write a press release on my article and sent the press release and the article in advance to news outlets, under embargo until the day of publication. I gave advance interviews to the press, timed for the publication of the scientific article.

Environmental Research Letters published the scientific article on September 24, 2018 (Gonzalez et al. 2018). The *Washington Post*, *Guardian*, and other public media published 45 original stories and 68 media outlets republished those stories <<http://www.patrickgonzalez.net>>.

On October 2, 2019, NPS relented and approved my UC Berkeley position as an “Outside Work Activity” (Document 2019-10-02 NPS approval of Gonzalez UC Berkeley). This, in effect, reversed their cease-and-desist letter.

Conclusion

I conduct high-level research on anthropogenic climate change that adds to published scientific knowledge and helps resource managers protect our national parks. My research shows historical impacts and future risks of anthropogenic climate change to U.S. national parks. Interference with climate change science hinders the application of science to the protection of our national parks.

The phrases “anthropogenic climate change” and “human-caused climate change” are important because they point to the solution to climate change, namely, reducing carbon pollution from cars, power plants, deforestation, and other human sources. Published scientific research shows that these reductions would reduce the risks of climate change in the U.S. national parks (Gonzalez 2017, Gonzalez et al. 2018).

National Park Service officials have tried to suppress my science and communications on human-caused climate change, but I have refused them and prevailed. I have stood steadfast for scientific integrity.

Scientific references

- Gonzalez, P. 2017. Climate change trends, impacts, and vulnerabilities in US national parks. In Beissinger, S.R., D.D. Ackerly, H. Doremus, and G.E. Machlis (eds.) *Science, Conservation, and National Parks*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Gonzalez, P., F. Wang, M. Notaro, D.J. Vimont, and J.W. Williams. 2018. Disproportionate magnitude of climate change in United States national parks. *Environmental Research Letters* 13: 104001. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aade09. <<http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aade09>>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2014. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- U.S. Global Change Research Program. 2017. *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I*. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC.

Documents

Attached, 25 files <Gonzalez scientific integrity documents.zip>

March 20, 2017	NPS sea level rise report draft
February 2, 2018	IPCC lead author invitation to Gonzalez
February 8, 2018	University of California, Berkeley, re-appointment of Gonzalez
March 23, 2018	NPS comment 1 on Gonzalez manuscript
March 23, 2018	NPS comment 2 on Gonzalez manuscript
March 23, 2018	NPS comments on Gonzalez manuscript
April 6, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to NPS on scientific integrity
April 6, 2018	University of Colorado e-mail on NPS pressure
April 11, 2018	NPS attempted deletion from sea level rise report
April 17, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail message to NPS on IPCC
April 17, 2018	Gonzalez summary of IPCC work
April 18, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail removing name from NPS sea level rise report
May 21, 2018	Gonzalez initial information to Interior Office of Inspector General

June 14, 2018	NPS reprimand
June 29, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to Interior Office of Inspector General
July 9, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to NPS on UC Berkeley
August 16, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to Interior Deputy Inspector General
September 4, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to NPS media request
November 6, 2018	Gonzalez e-mail to NPS on violations
March 21, 2019	NPS cease-and-desist letter
April 22, 2019	Gonzalez reply to NPS cease-and-desist
April 22, 2019	UC Berkeley letter to NPS supporting Gonzalez
May 22, 2019	NPS second letter to Gonzalez
May 30, 2019	Gonzalez second reply to NPS
October 2, 2019	NPS approval of Gonzalez UC Berkeley outside activity