

From: ned.ford@sfsierra.sierraclub.org  
 Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 1:54 AM  
 To: globalwarming@buster.law.pace.edu  
 Subject: Re: CO2 and Plants

Ex. 30  
 Case No(s). EO-2005-0329  
 Date 6-24-05 Apr KF

To: The person who wrote the question at the end of this message, who is anonymous to me because of the quirks of this list  
 From: Ned Ford

No. I can't show you those things. I'm sure you can research them GRL article, if you care to. I don't understand why skeptics are so eager to accept the proposition that the satellite data means one thing, and so unwilling to accept that maybe their views are unsupported. I am not a qualified expert, so my showing you things I research would be of little value, to people who assert that this all relies on "proof".

Proof that warming is occurring is abundantly available. Proof that it will cause specific impacts at specific times in specific places is far beyond our capabilities today. Demonstrating that the latter is true, i.e. that it is impossible to define the impact of climate change in advance of it happening, hardly disproves the former. For the people that don't believe in CO2 having an impact, I'm trying to locate some sources, but it takes time, as I have other things going on in my life as well.

- Ned

ned.ford@sfsierra.sierraclub.org wrote:

>  
 > I thought this snip from another message would interest this Forum:  
 >  
 > \* The short-term satellite data purport(s) to show a global  
 > cooling trend since 1979. Not only is this time frame far  
 > too short to be climatically relevant, the data is used  
 > without citing the Geophysical Research Letters article  
 > showing that, when corrected for El Nino and volcanic  
 > activity, the satellite record shows the same warming trend  
 > as the surface record. The same GRL paper shows that  
 > longer term radiosonde data (often cited as confirming the  
 > accuracy of the satellites) shows a warming trend, with  
 > or without correction, consistent with the century long  
 > surface temperature record.  
 >  
 > - Ned  
 >  
 > Ned.Ford@Sierraclub.org

Can you show me the numbers, data collection, and data analysis methods?

From: ned.ford@sfsierra.sierraclub.org  
 Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 3:59 AM  
 To: globalwarming@buster.law.pace.edu  
 Subject: Re: Re[2]: CO2 and Plants

If Phil Filner were a little less hostile to people whose views he disagrees with, he might learn a little more a little faster. Correcting satellite data is not the same as massaging it, especially if one explains what the correction is.

**FILED<sup>4</sup>**  
 JUL 13 2005  
 Missouri Public  
 Service Commission

The raw satellite data proves nothing at all. It is a meaningless string of numbers. It has to be correlated with known observations in order to determine whether certain factors skew the numbers. I believe the people working with the raw numbers are not sure it has been adequately correlated yet, to produce confidence that all the measurements are comparable with each other. Over time, such a lack of confidence evaporates, because the accumulated data becomes meaningful in reference to itself, but one still has to be sure that the data represents something specific, before assuming that it proves something in relation to other factors.

I am reasonably confident that the eco-nazis have not yet floated thousands of little balloons with easily readable thermometers for the satellites to read. I do not personally claim to understand the precise operation of the measurements, but I can tell from things I read, that most of the scientists are more concerned with identifying correcting factors such as increasing the comparability of the satellite data with surface measurements, so that the usefulness of the satellite data may be established, than they are with claiming that it means anything specific.

The Sierra Club is not for the faint of heart. It is a vast organization with many internal conflicts, as previously noted here. It has a long history of establishing positions that ultimately become accepted by the public as the way things ought to be done. No one will force anyone to join, and many of the members are involved in outdoor activities, and won't be involved in activism for any reason. Still, it is as much a democracy as the United States is, and if proof that global warming was not of concern is ever developed, I, for one, will work to eliminate this issue from our repertoire.

The grain of truth to Mr. Filner's accusation, is that if global warming were not a concern, there would still be perfectly good economic reasons to do most of the things we advocate, and good scientific and ecological reasons for doing the rest (things like protecting old growth timber).

Ned.Ford@Sierraclub.org

From: ned.ford@sfsierra.sierraclub.org  
 Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 3:14 AM  
 To: globalwarming@buster.law.pace.edu  
 Subject: Re: CO2 and Plants

From Ned Ford  
 To Rich deSousa, et al

Rich wrote:

In your earlier post you stated that the satellites were in error when they reported no warming; now you concede that the satellites are not in error when they have not been recording any temperature increase during the past two decades, which has been verified by the weather balloons, but that twenty years is too short a time in climate history to be of any use.

Ned replies:

I did not say the satellites were in error. I said that the evidence produced by them, which you or someone else asserted proved a cooling trend, did not do so, because they measured temperatures too high in the atmosphere to support conclusions about what is happening on the ground or anywhere close to it. You said that four miles up was not the "upper" atmosphere, which I probably said, not being particularly technically oriented, myself. I then pointed out