Attachment: July 23, July 30 and August 7 repeated e-mail requests for information to Wegman, Scott and Said. NO answer forthcoming. D. R.

Aug 16 11:04 2006 Page 1

Date: Mon, 7 Aug 2006 11:01:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: David M. Ritson <dmr@slac.stanford.edu>
To: ewegman@gmu.edu
Cc: scottdw@rice.edu, yhs@jhu.edu, Gerald North <g-north@tamu.edu>,
mann@psu.edu, Gavin Schmidt <gschmidt@giss.nasa.gov>
Subject: Re: Your report

Dear Drs Wegman, Scott and Said,

I am again forwarding to you my previous requests for information essential to evaluate and replicate elements of your report to Congressional Energy committee. I understand that people are away or pursuing other interests over the summer. However minimal professional courtesy would generally have ensured a reply as to when you people would provide the requested information. If I do not receive a reply in the next days I can only presume that the requested information will not be supplied. Frankly such an outcome would be quite unprecedented over my long scientific career

Sincerely

David Ritson

==========

David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics
Physics Dept
Varian Physics Building
382 Via Pueblo Mall
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu
Telephone number: 650/723-2685
FAX Number: 650/725/6544

==========

On Sun, 30 Jul 2006, David M. Ritson wrote:

>
> Dear Dr Wegman and colleagues,
>
> I am forwarding below an e-mail I sent you and your colleagues
> requesting essential, but missing, basic, information relative to your
> report to Congress.
>
> To facilitate a reply I attach the Auto-Correlation Function used
> by the M&M to generate their persistent red noise simulations for their

> figures shown by you in your Section 4 (this was kindly provided me by M&M on
> Nov 6 2004). The black values are the ones actually used by M&M. They derive
> directly from the seventy North American tree proxies, assuming the proxy
values
> to be TREND-LESS noise.
> Surely you realized that the proxies combine the signal components on which
is
> superimposed the noise? I find it hard to believe that you would take
> data with obvious trends, would then directly evaluate ACFs without

Aug 16 11:04 2006 Page 2

> removing the trends, and then finally assume you had obtained results for
the
> proxy specific noise! You will notice that the M&M inputs purport to show
> strong persistence out to lag-times of 350 years or beyond.
> Your report makes no mention of this quite improper M&M procedure
> used to obtain their ACFs. Neither do you provide any specification data for
> your own results that you contend confirm the M&M results. Relative to your
> Figure 4.4 you state
> "One of the most compelling illustrations that M&M have produced
> is created by feeding red noise (AR(1) with parameter = .2 into the MBH
> algorithm".
> In fact they used and needed the extraordinarily high persistances contained
in
> the attatched figure to obtain their `compelling' results.
>
> Obviously the information requested below is essential for replication and
> evaluation of your committee's results. I trust you will provide it in
> timely fashion.
>
> Sincerely
>
> David Ritson
>
==========

> David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics
> Physics Dept
> Varian Physics Building
> 382 Via Pueblo Mall
> Stanford University
> Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA
>
> e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu

> Telephone number: 650/723-2685
> FAX Number: 650/725/6544
>
==========
>
>
>
>
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
> Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2006 15:31:09 -0700 (PDT)
> From: David M. Ritson <dmr@slac.stanford.edu>
> To: ewegman@gmu.edu
> Cc: scottdw@rice.edu, yhs@jhu.edu, Gerald North <g-north@tamu.edu>,
> mann@psu.edu
> Subject: Your report
>
>
> Dear Dr. Wegman,
>
> I read with interest you report to the Barton congressional committee.
> I am very familiar with the work and controversies surrounding the
> generation of "hockey-sticks" from trend-less red noise. Your Section 4
> showed several figures, accompanied by discussion. I have read it

> carefully, and would appreciate some clarifications as to factual details.
>
> 1). Which of the figures derive from M&M work and which were
> independently derived by you?
>
> 2). M&M used ARFIMA persistent red-noise throughout their published
> work. You state that your figure 4.4 results from AR(1) .2 red-noise?
> If so did you otherwise follow M&M using short-span normalization
> and 70 member Monte Carlo generated ensembles? Did you use the same
> AR(1) .2 noise to generate all your figures?
>
> 3). If you indeed used similar persistent red-noise to that used by
> M&M do you believe it to be in accord with real-world proxy-specific noise?
>
> 4). Any of my colleagues would have routinely checked their results
> to see if their derived PC1 (etc) derived from a systematic signal or from
> random noise. For example for a 70 member population, all that is required

> is to use the extracted PC1 vector from the 70 members, and apply it to
> each member to project out its relative sign (and amplitude). For signal
> dominated results one sign will predominate and for noise dominated
> results both signs will be roughly equally present. Needless to say when, a
> couple of years ago, I checked the M&M work, I did just that.
>
> The questions raised by your report are clearly of importance, and I
> would very much appreciate your clarifications of the above,
>
> Sincerely
>
> David Ritson
>

==========

> David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics
> Physics Dept
> Varian Physics Building
> 382 Via Pueblo Mall
> Stanford University
> Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA
>
> e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu
> Telephone number: 650/723-2685
> FAX Number: 650/725/6544
>

==========

>
>