

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

2321 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301

(202) 225-6371  
<http://science.house.gov>

August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025

The Honorable Lee Zeldin  
Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Administrator Zeldin,

The mission of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is to protect human health and the environment. It is deeply disturbing that we feel the need to remind you of this 55-year-old commitment of the agency you run. But it is clear that you fail to hold yourself to this standard. Instead, as evidenced by nearly every action you've taken as Administrator, you place the bottom line of polluting industry over the interests of the American people, time and time again. It is hard to pick the most damning example of your twisted priorities, but the July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2025, announcement of your intention to rescind the Endangerment Finding is surely near the top. As Ranking Members on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we remind you that the Endangerment Finding is rooted in science, and we demand that you account for the process by which you intend to repeal it.

As a politician with no environmental science experience, you may need an explanation of the overwhelming scientific justification for the Endangerment Finding and how it underpins EPA's responsibility to protect human health. The Endangerment Finding is simple and clear – it states that “greenhouse gases in the atmosphere endanger both the public health and the environment for future and current generations.”<sup>1</sup> This is uncontroversial – and, in fact, conservatively stated – in the scientific community. It is only disputed by fringe cranks who pay their bills by pandering to industries whose profits rely on unfettered air pollution and worsening climate change – and, by extension, the politicians like yourself who rely on those industries at the expense of the American public,<sup>2</sup> including their own constituents.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “EPA’s Endangerment Finding,” Environmental Protection Agency, December 7, 2009, accessed here: [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-08/documents/endangermentfinding\\_legalbasis.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-08/documents/endangermentfinding_legalbasis.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Timothy Cama, “Here’s who gave campaign cash to EPA nominee Lee Zeldin,” *E&E News*, November 22, 2024, accessed here: <https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/eenews/2024/11/22/heres-who-gave-campaign-cash-to-epa-nominee-lee-zeldin-00190969>

<sup>3</sup> Miranda Willson, “Rising tides are coming for Lee Zeldin’s hometown,” *E&E News*, December 19, 2024, accessed here: <https://www.eenews.net/articles/rising-tides-are-coming-for-lee-zeldins-hometown/>

The Endangerment Finding was issued in 2009 based upon a wealth of scientific evidence of the risk greenhouse gases pose to public health. The Endangerment Finding was issued in full compliance with all the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). In conjunction with EPA's release of the repeal proposal, you publicly asserted that the Obama Administration "didn't go out for public comment" during its promulgation of the 2009 Endangerment Finding.<sup>4</sup> This assertion is flatly untrue, because the 2009 Endangerment Finding did include a 60-day public comment period<sup>5</sup>; EPA responded to these comments with over 900 pages of documentation.<sup>6</sup> It is bizarre that you chose to issue such an easily disproven lie, but this lie raises questions about whether you have any intention of following the process outlined in the APA when you rush the agency into your predetermined conclusion to repeal the Endangerment Finding.

The same day as your announcement, the Department of Energy (DOE) released a report – written by a handful of the aforementioned fringe cranks – intended to support the dismantling of the Endangerment Finding.<sup>7</sup> The report rehashes and repeats old claims that the climate denial movement has relied upon for decades to mislead and confuse the public. These claims have been repeatedly debunked and are not worth dignifying here with a direct rebuttal. What is worth emphasizing is how tiny and marginal the perspective represented by the authors of that report truly is. The scientific consensus in support of the fact that climate change represents a danger to human health and the environment is as robust and universal as any scientific consensus can be. Every authoritative group or body that has been tasked with studying this issue has reached the same conclusion, from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change – which includes member states such as Saudi Arabia and Russia, hardly paragons of progressivism – to the U.S. Global Change Research Program, to the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, as well as governments and independent scientists around the world. By contrast, the five individuals who wrote the DOE report represent a viewpoint so negligible in persuasive force and scientific support that it does not even exist as a credible argument in the global scientific debate. Yet theirs is the viewpoint that has been elevated in EPA's consideration of the scientific basis for the Endangerment Finding. It is a decision so baffling, and so devoid of any legitimate basis, that it can only be taken as a sign of the agency's bad faith.

Furthermore, in the press release accompanying the report, DOE focused on "[unleashing] American energy dominance" in policymaking, and "expanding access to reliable, affordable

---

<sup>4</sup> Jean Chemnick, "Zeldin previews his big climate move. Here's a fact check," *E&E News*, July 29, 2025, accessed here: <https://www.eenews.net/articles/zeldin-previews-his-big-climate-move-heres-a-fact-check/>.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> "Appendices and PDF Versions of EPA's Response to Public Comments on the Proposed Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases: Volumes 1-11," Environmental Protection Agency, accessed here: <https://www.epa.gov/climate-change/appendices-and-pdf-versions-epas-response-public-comments-proposed-endangerment-and-cause-or-contribute-findings-for-greenhouse-gases-volumes-1-11>.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Energy Climate Working Group, "A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate," July 23, 2025, accessed here: [https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-07/DOE\\_Critical\\_Review\\_of\\_Impacts\\_of\\_GHG\\_Emissions\\_on\\_the\\_US\\_Climate\\_July\\_2025.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-07/DOE_Critical_Review_of_Impacts_of_GHG_Emissions_on_the_US_Climate_July_2025.pdf).

energy.”<sup>8</sup> To be clear, this has absolutely nothing to do with the core of the Endangerment Finding, which is the fact that greenhouse gases endanger public health. This fact is inconvenient for the Trump Administration, and it is particularly troublesome for the EPA, whose responsibility is to protect human health and the environment above all else. Your agency has apparently outsourced the responsibility of identifying a scientific underpinning for this wrongheaded and dangerous decision to an agency with an entirely different mission. We are confident that the public comments submitted by environmental health researchers and medical doctors will reaffirm the scientific consensus: that greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. It is clear, however, based on your incessant, preemptive bragging about the forthcoming repeal of the Endangerment Finding, that you have no intention of following the science.

If you had a firm scientific basis for this decision, you would likely not feel the need to mislead the public repeatedly about the Endangerment Finding and about your agency’s responsibility to the American people. To set the record straight, EPA is required by law to regulate pollutants that pose a danger to public health, without watering those regulations down for reasons unrelated to protecting health and the environment. Despite your claim to the contrary, when EPA went through its science-based, deliberative process that led to the Endangerment Finding, it considered how greenhouse gases do have some short-term benefits related to forestry and crop yield; the scientific process played out, and those benefits fell short when compared to the catastrophic long-term effects of climate change.<sup>9</sup> Your focus on the economic burden imposed by regulations never acknowledges that there are concrete financial benefits for the average American. Climate change deniers have long rejected the obvious fact that health benefits are incredibly valuable. You also apparently ignore the fact that drivers save thousands of dollars in fuel and maintenance costs thanks to emissions standards.<sup>10</sup> If everything you have said is untrue, how can the American people trust that you will be truthful and transparent as you take a step that will have severe consequences on their health?

The Endangerment Finding articulates a simple truth that is backed up by a wealth of scientific evidence. It is imperative that EPA explain how it intends to ensure that any attempt to repeal the Endangerment Finding will incorporate the best available science, regardless of how it aligns with your preferred outcome. In order for the Science Committee to conduct oversight over EPA’s scientific decision making, please provide answers to the following questions no later than 5:00 PM on Tuesday, September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025:

1. What is your plan for engaging the Science Advisory Board (SAB) on the retraction of the Endangerment Finding?

---

<sup>8</sup> “Department of Energy Issues Report Evaluating Impact of Greenhouse Gasses on U.S. Climate, Invites Public Comment,” Department of Energy, July 29, 2025, accessed here: <https://www.energy.gov/articles/departments-energy-issues-report-evaluating-impact-greenhouse-gasses-us-climate-invites>

<sup>9</sup> Jean Chemnick, “Zeldin previews his big climate move. Here’s a fact check,” *E&E News*, July 29, 2025, accessed here: <https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/eenews/2025/07/29/zeldin-previews-his-big-climate-move-heres-a-fact-check-00481721>

<sup>10</sup> Maxine Joselow and Lisa Friedman, “In Game-Changing Climate Rollback, E.P.A. Aims to Kill a Bedrock Scientific Finding,” *The New York Times*, July 29, 2025, accessed here: <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/29/climate/epa-endangerment-finding-repeal-proposal.html>

2. Who wrote the proposal to rescind the Endangerment Finding? When was the proposal written?
3. When EPA moves toward finalizing the rule rescinding the Endangerment Finding, will EPA be the primary author?
4. Does EPA intend to use the DOE report titled, “A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate,” if the report has not, at the point of rule finalization, gone through a traditional peer review process?

In addition, please provide the following to the Committee:

1. All documents and communications (including, but not limited to, emails, text messages, instant messages, comments, notes, analyses, legal and other memoranda, letters, telephone logs, Signal messages, meeting minutes, calendar entries, PowerPoint slides, and presentation materials) exchanged between EPA and the Office of Management and Budget regarding the repeal of the Endangerment Finding.
2. All documents and communications (including, but not limited to, emails, text messages, instant messages, comments, notes, analyses, legal and other memoranda, letters, telephone logs, Signal messages, meeting minutes, calendar entries, PowerPoint slides, and presentation materials) exchanged between EPA and DOE regarding the repeal of the Endangerment Finding.
3. All documents and communications (including, but not limited to, emails, text messages, instant messages, comments, notes, analyses, legal and other memoranda, letters, telephone logs, Signal messages, meeting minutes, calendar entries, PowerPoint slides, and presentation materials) exchanged between EPA and the Trump Vance 2025 Transition Team regarding the repeal of the Endangerment Finding.
4. All documents and communications (including, but not limited to, emails, text messages, instant messages, comments, notes, analyses, legal and other memoranda, letters, telephone logs, Signal messages, meeting minutes, calendar entries, PowerPoint slides, and presentation materials) exchanged between EPA and DOE regarding the report titled, “A Critical Review of Impacts of Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the U.S. Climate.”
5. All documents and communications (including, but not limited to, emails, text messages, instant messages, comments, notes, analyses, legal and other memoranda, letters, telephone logs, Signal messages, meeting minutes, calendar entries, PowerPoint slides, and presentation materials) within EPA regarding the agency’s review of the scientific basis for the proposal to repeal the Endangerment Finding.

Pursuant to Rule X of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology “shall review and study on a continuing basis laws, programs, and Government activities relating to nonmilitary research and development.”<sup>11</sup> The Committee possesses jurisdiction over environmental research and development.<sup>12</sup> If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Sara Palasits or Josh Schneider with the Committee’s Minority staff at (202) 225-6375. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

---

<sup>11</sup> [119 First Session House Rules](#).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

Sincerely,



Zoe Lofgren  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology



Gabe Amo  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Environment

CC: Chairman Brian Babin  
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology

Chairman Scott Franklin  
Subcommittee on Environment