

Beth Dumesco

From: Beth Dumesco
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 2:02 PM
To: julie.roberts@noaa.gov
Cc: neil.jacobs@noaa.gov
Subject: Re: Statement on Dorian and Alabama

Dear Ms. Roberts,

I understand that it is you that issued the statement, by tweet and webpost. Do you have any idea the damage you have done to NOAA's reputation and credibility? Do you care?

NOAA is no place for a political hack. We taxpaying citizens need to know that our weather data and forecasts are accurate and honest. To help you understand, ask yourself what you would think if the NWS put out an inaccurate forecast for heavy snow during a Trump rally in New Hampshire. That you used official channels of communication to support Trump in his self-created problem is itself unethical, and maybe illegal. Aren't you covered by the Hatch Act?

You should resign immediately. You should make yourself legit by getting a job in Trump's reelection campaign.

Sincerely,
Beth Dumesco

On Sat, Sep 7, 2019 at 1:24 PM Beth Dumesco <(b)(6)> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Beth Dumesco <(b)(6)>
Date: Sat, Sep 7, 2019 at 12:05 PM
Subject: Re: Statement on Dorian and Alabama
To: <neil.jacobs@noaa.gov>

I would like to add that you need to read your own agency's policy on public information dissemination.

Here's the link: https://www.cio.noaa.gov/services_programs/IQ_Guidelines_103014.html

Mr. Jacobs, if you okayed the posting of the statement, you need to resign.

On Sat, Sep 7, 2019 at 11:15 AM Beth Dumesco <(b)(6)> wrote:

I read this statement on the homepage of your website:

From Wednesday, August 28, through Monday, September 2, the information provided by NOAA and the National Hurricane Center to President Trump and the wider public demonstrated that tropical-storm-force winds from Hurricane Dorian could impact Alabama. This is clearly demonstrated in Hurricane Advisories #15 through #41, which can be viewed at the [following link](#).

The Birmingham National Weather Service's Sunday morning tweet spoke in absolute terms that were inconsistent with probabilities from the best forecast products available at the time.

I am in shock, but I'm not disbelieving what I see. It appears that NOAA has come under political influence, specifically under the influence of Mr. Trump. It appears that someone outside of NOAA wrote this statement, **but there it is**, front and center, in **large font** on your homepage. I can't believe a professional meteorologist wrote this statement. It reads like a lawyer wrote it.

This is so wrong on so many levels!

1. The Montgomery Alabama office was correct to issue a short tweet correcting the misinformation. They didn't mention Trump's name. It was Trump who politicized the tweet.
2. Politicizing NOAA makes it harder to trust you. Your ability to meet your mission is being sullied for the sake of Trump's ego and inability to admit to any mistake, no matter how trivial.
3. Yet another institution of government is caving to the childish demands of a man who was accidentally elected and proves himself to be irrational every day. I don't expect or want NOAA to weigh in on what Trump says about the weather. Just say what you think to be true, like that man in Alabama.

I can believe that Trump threatened NOAA with reduced funding. This at a time when you are working hard to improve services, accuracy, the website, statements... But, if you let Trump get away with this, your credibility is decreased. Without credibility, what have you got? **Either put a name or names on this statement and back it up or disavow the statement as political, not coming from NOAA, and take it down.**

I want to add how I feel about it and how this affects me personally. I live on my boat in the Chesapeake Bay. I need to have the best, most accurate information on major storms. If a hurricane is coming close, as Isabelle did, I need to take evasive action. Depending on the storm's track, I will decide to get hauled out, (which is an expense, and I can't live on the boat while its on shore), move to a more sheltered marina slip, or head to a "hurricane hole" and anchor out, running lines to nearby trees. All involve a lot of work, stripping everything that creates windage off the decks, protecting electronics, and taking the mast down. Now, I wonder if I can trust NOAA and NHC. If you alter past forecasts to suit Trump, what's to stop you from altering forecasts that Trump doesn't like? What if Trump plans a rally in North Carolina and the forecast is heavy rain and flooding, but Trump wants his "huge audience with thousands of people outside?" What if Trump has a meeting scheduled at one of his resorts, and he doesn't want to reschedule it? Should I check with independent meteorologists to get their predictions? But aren't those meteorologist dependent on NOAA observations and data? Who else has the capability to do that level of data gathering and analysis? Maybe I should look to Canada, Germany or the UK for their weather services' predictions?

Sincerely yours,
Beth Dumesco

--

E. BETH DUMESCO
Aboard M.Y. *Compass Rose*

Mobile: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

--

E. BETH DUMESCO
Aboard M.Y. *Compass Rose*

Mobile: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

--

E. BETH DUMESCO
Aboard M.Y. *Compass Rose*

Mobile: (b)(6)
(b)(6)

--

E. BETH DUMESCO
Aboard M.Y. *Compass Rose*

Mobile: (b)(6)
(b)(6)