

## About Wisconsin's Climate Report

Dear Mr. Nichols,

I read your opinion piece about the Wisconsin climate report, which was posted on Joe D'Aleo's [ICECAP.us web site](http://www.icecap.us). I appreciate your overall skepticism of the report, and especially of the "projections".

One should be equally skeptical of the report's assessment of the past, too. Your paragraph that tipped me off is... "I say "recent past" because there is a ton we don't and can't know prior to 1950. What we do know, according to the report by the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts, is that between 1950 and 2006 our annual average temperature here in the Badger State rose by a single degree - 1.1 to be exact."

Actually, there is a lot we do know about Wisconsin's climate before 1950, since Weather Bureau reports began before 1895. You can view a nice compilation of graphs at:

[http://www.appinsys.com/GlobalWarming/RS\\_WisconsinUSA.htm](http://www.appinsys.com/GlobalWarming/RS_WisconsinUSA.htm)

or see the "official" version of the annual temperatures at:

<http://www.aos.wisc.edu/~sco/clim-history/state/graphics/WI-temp-annual.gif>

A casual glance at any of the graphs shows that if the report writers chose an earlier date than 1950 (and why not - the data is there) they would get an even smaller warming trend - or none at all (if you choose 1930 or so). This is due to the cyclical nature of the entire record, with peaks around 1930 and 2000, and dips around 1910 and 1970.

There's a tendency in climate reports to snow data about how much hurricanes, rain events, temperatures, and many other local, regional, and global records have risen since 1950, 1960, or 1970, even if the data extends back to 1900 or even 1850. Why would they choose such a late starting date for their trend lines, when the entire data set almost always shows a cyclical nature? Do we even need to ask?

Best

Dr. Richard Keen, emeritus  
University of Colorado, Boulder