



Background and Messaging on August 2025 DOE Report: A Critical Review of Impacts of GHG Emissions on the U.S. Climate

Use this document to familiarize yourself with the issues at play and use the sample social media posts to explain to friends and family to spread awareness. EPN is crafting our own formal comments (contact [Michelle Montoya](#) for more information), but we have also created a [list of recommendations and issues](#) that you can focus on if you would like to submit your own individual comments (due September 2).

Below you will find:

[Background](#)

[Topline Messages](#)

[Key Issues](#)

[Sample Quotes](#)

[Sample Social Media Posts](#)

Background

The Department of Energy's recently released [climate report](#) claims to evaluate existing peer-reviewed literature and government data on climate impacts of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and provide a critical assessment of the conventional narrative on climate change. The report concludes that carbon dioxide (CO₂) -induced warming appears to be less damaging economically than commonly believed, and that aggressive mitigation strategies could be more harmful than beneficial. Additionally, the report finds that U.S. policy actions are expected to have undetectably small direct impacts on the global climate and any effects will emerge only with long delays.

A federal lawsuit was filed by the Environmental Defense Fund and the Union of Concerned Scientists alleging that the Trump administration violated the law by secretly recruiting a group of people who reject the scientific consensus on climate change to write a report downplaying global warming. The lawsuit accuses the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency of "flagrant violations" of a law that governs advisory committees. It also alleges that in March Secretary Wright, "quietly arranged for five handpicked skeptics of the effects of climate change" to form a committee called the Climate Working Group that then wrote a report downplaying the threat.

The report seeks to overturn the consensus of the overwhelming majority of scientists who study climate change and its impacts. This consensus was not reached overnight or with a single report but has been steadily built over decades and on the foundation of thousands of studies and reports. Despite the claims of the authors, the report does not present any new information or raise fundamental discrepancies with the core physics. The Trump administration's underlying message is that these five authors, whose well-known critiques of the consensus science have been consistently debunked, are correct, and the vast body of the climate science community is wrong. The question for reviewers and commenters is whether the report legitimately and scientifically demonstrates the authors' claim that the consensus science is too uncertain to serve as the basis for action.

DOE is accepting [public comments](#) until September 2, 2025 .

Topline Messages

The DOE's climate science report is deeply flawed. It misrepresents established science, excludes credible experts and peer review, and uses misleading data analysis to undermine the overwhelming consensus on climate change. This is not sound science; it is an attempt to create doubt where there is none.

Key Issues

1. Author Selection and Expertise

- **Lack of balance:** The authors represent a narrow and biased set of perspectives, excluding scientists who support the established consensus on climate science.
- **Insufficient expertise:** The small author team does not cover the breadth of topics addressed in the report.
- **Known bias:** Several authors have a history of critiques that have been repeatedly debunked.

2. Peer Review and Transparency

- **No independent review:** The report fails to disclose reviewers, their expertise, or affiliations.
- **No public input:** The report was released without a public comment period before being used for major regulatory decisions.
- **Lack of transparency:** Review comments and agency responses were not published, which prevents accountability.

3. Misrepresentation of Climate Science

- **Overstating uncertainty:** The report uses well-known and minor uncertainties to falsely imply that climate science as a whole is unreliable.
- **Ignoring primary metrics:** It downplays the strong performance of climate models in predicting global mean surface temperature, which is the most important indicator, and instead focuses on secondary or obscure measures.
- **Cherry-picking data:** Unusual timeframes (e.g., 45-year trends) and spatially limited analyses are used to distort conclusions.
- **Misusing studies:** Some cited research is portrayed inaccurately, which contradicts the authors' own findings.

4. Flawed Scientific Methods

- **Overreliance on small datasets:** Broad claims are drawn from limited samples (e.g., sea level rise).
- **Simplistic analysis:** Outdated or inappropriate statistical methods (such as basic linear regression) are used where more robust methods would show different results.
- **Irrelevant content:** Includes unrelated material (e.g., CO₂ permissible exposure limits) that distracts from the central issue.

5. Impact on Policy and Public Health

- **Undermines legal and regulatory foundations:** The report's goal appears to be weakening the scientific justification for climate action.
- **Public health risk:** Delaying or rolling back climate protections based on this flawed analysis will increase exposure to extreme weather, air pollution, and related health threats.
- **Disproportionate harm:** Communities already most affected by climate change will bear the heaviest burden.

Sample Quotes

- “This report isn’t about advancing science; it’s about manufacturing doubt.”
- “A small, biased group of authors is trying to overturn decades of peer-reviewed climate research.”
- “Climate science is robust and reliable. This report misuses data to suggest otherwise.”

Sample Social Media Posts

Twitter / Threads / Bluesky

The DOE’s new climate report isn’t science; it’s a political stunt.

Small group of biased authors.

No independent review.

Cherry-picked data to sow doubt.

Climate science is clear: action is urgent.

The DOE’s climate report ignores decades of peer-reviewed research, overstates minor uncertainties, and misuses data.

Real science protects lives.

Junk science costs them.

When the DOE uses flawed methods + biased authors to rewrite climate science, the result is dangerous policy that puts our health and safety at risk. Communities deserve the truth, not manufactured doubt.

No independent review.

No transparency.

No credibility.

The DOE’s climate report is built to undermine protections we depend on.

Reject junk science. Demand accountability.

The Department of Energy’s climate report is junk science — biased authors, no peer review, and cherry-picked data. Now they want to use it to block climate action. Submit your comment by **Sept. 2** to reject this dangerous rewrite of reality. Speak up:

<https://www.regulations.gov/commenton/DOE-HQ-2025-0207-0001>

[LinkedIn/Facebook/Instagram](#)

Post 1

The DOE's climate science report is misleading, biased, and dangerous.

Here's what you should know:

- ➡ Authors with a record of debunked critiques wrote it — without balanced expertise.
- ➡ No independent peer review or public comment period.
- ➡ Cherry-picked data and flawed methods distort the science.

If this report guides policy, then communities will face greater health risks from extreme weather and pollution.

[Submit public comments](#) by Sept. 2.

Post 2

The DOE's climate report overstates uncertainty and ignores the overwhelming scientific consensus. It's not about advancing science; it's about creating doubt to delay action. Science is clear. Climate change is real, it's happening now, and lives depend on strong protections.

[Submit public comments](#) by Sept. 2

Resources

- [Outline](#) for DOE commentators