

From: Frankknee@aol.com
Date: Thu, 31 Oct 2002 09:49:33 EST
Subject: File for CORRECTION OF DATA; submitted October 31, 2002 to NASA:
To: infoquality@hq.nasa.gov, nkaplan@hq.nasa.gov, dsavage@hq.nasa.gov, ppastore@hq.nasa.gov (Paul Pastorek), o'keefe@hq.nasa.gov, sean.o'keefe@hq.nasa.gov, gorelick@esther.la.asu.edu, chyba@seti.org, atkins@nae.edu, saunders@scn1.jpl.nasa.gov, ronald.s.saunders@jpl.nasa.gov, saunders@jpl.nasa.gov, james.garvin@hq.nasa.gov, dtillman@nas.edu, ed.weiler@hq.nasa.gov, hcrater@utsi.edu, webbdc@earthlink.net, sshostak@seti.org, rgould@cfa.harvard.edu, pianna@nsf.gov, aas@aas.org, rmo@virginia.edu (roberto'neil), yourview@brook.edu, dmorrison@mail.arc.nasa.gov, camorrow@colorado.edu, comments@hq.nasa.gov, dwoods@hq.nasa.gov, michelle.derrington@hq.nasa.gov, michelle.campbell@hq.nasa.gov, cpilcher@hq.nasa.gov, jrosendhal@hq.nasa.gov, naugust@princeton.edu, stephen.c.brewster@jpl.nasa.gov, jgarvin@hq.nasa.gov, mmalin@msss.com, brucealb@nas.edu, nasiom@nas.edu, townmeet@nas.edu, ombwatch@ombwatch.org, UFOLAWYER1@aol.com, n6tx@setileague.org, ostpinfo@ostp.eop.gov, cchase@ostp.eop.gov, ssokul@ostp.eop.gov, pressinquiries@hq.space.com, admnlist@nas.edu
CC: Steve.Feldberg@MSNBC.COM, redhed8910@yahoo.com, rr1947@yahoo.com, bullitt@carolina.rr.com, ExPPAC@aol.com, keyhole@rochester.rr.com, kstein@usacable.net, cdeterman@podestamattoon.com, lkean@ix.netcom.com, podesta@law.georgetown.edu, llandsman@usacable.net, rothschild@podestamattoon.com, SDonaldson@ABCNEWS.com, evan_hadingham@wgbh.org, harvey_fineberg@harvard.edu, scot.stride@gte.net (Scot Stride), scot.stride@jpl.nasa.gov, eWarrior@electricwarrior.com, oleary1998@yahoo.com, drichards@smtp.seti-inst.edu, rbritt@hq.space.com, dser@aaas.org, mmewhinney@mail.arc.nasa.gov, jdunbar@mail.arc.nasa.gov, gdeardorff@mail.arc.nasa.gov, gbriggs@mail.arc.nasa.gov, 1161739@skytel.com, tarter@vger.seti.org, LanFleming@aol.com, copyme@nas.edu, SGroup@nas.edu, iap@nas.edu, dlwillia@pop900.gsfc.nasa.gov, dsphinx1@attbi.com, kclarke@geog.ucsb.edu, Jay.zwally@gsfc.nasa.gov, nids@anv.net

File for CORRECTION OF DATA to be submitted October 31, 2002 to NASA:

RE: **Data Quality Act** inquiry concerning problems with NASA dissemination of data
October 30th 2002

On behalf of Ames Laboratory consultant, Keith Laney, and the American public at large of whom have a stake in the knowledge gained through Mr. Laney's interpretation of NASA data, we wish to submit for an official inquiry, for the purpose that NASA conduct a "**correction of data**" as outlined by NASA guidelines for the defined mandates of the **Data Quality Act**, of which were implemented recently by Congress. Keith Laney is to be considered the primary "affected party ." Since Keith Laney has observed Mars Odyssey THEMIS data by request of science writer, Richard Hoagland, and his organization known as "The Enterprise Mission ," he reserves the right to include Mr. Hoagland's organization also as an "affected party ."

We mean, when we say "American public at large" as represented by the most recent poll concerning SETI Research, known as the Roper poll, which showed a clear majority of 72 percent of the American public felt the government has not been forthcoming about what it knows about SETI matters. We hold that the interest of America is bound to our inquiry and therefore the public is to be considered, as well, an affected party. I, as a producer, represent the majority public opinion concerning The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence. Therefore I consider myself, through associations with The Enterprise Mission and being a professional communicator aligned with this Inquisition, an affected party also.

The incident in question concerning possible non-transparency, non-credibility, non-integrity of NASA/ASU data, transpired on July 25th 2002, whereby Keith Laney made a download directly from the Mars Odyssey THEMIS section at the NASA/ASU Internet site, under recommendations of a person claiming to be a NASA employee, and that this download appeared to be different in nature than downloads which were made earlier from that same NASA Internet source, as well as downloads that were made later. Put in Mr. Laney's own words, please read the following e-mail he sent to me:

Re: I need to hear from you now please... Date: 10/28/2002 11:09:33 PM Eastern Standard Time From: Bullitt@carolina.rr.com <<mailto:Bullitt@carolina.rr.com>> To: <<mailto:Frankknee@aol.com>> Frankknee@aol.com <<mailto:Frankknee@aol.com>> Sent from the Internet (Details)

Hi Frank,

It's as easy as this, I received a different Cydonia infrared image upon download than what was the supposed to be the ASU THEMIS webpage's official version. It is unquestionably different from as officially portrayed at the site now and at that time, and unquestionably different from the images as portrayed now in the raw pds releases.

I've already went over the whole ordeal in detail here,
<http://www.keithlaney.com/timeline.htm>
excerpted:

"Timeline, Testimony, Processing, and Politics of a Leaked THEMIS Image"

The politics.

I had been sharing my imaging results with Richard Hoagland and Mike Bara, who after review of them were astounded also. The strange thing about it was that no one else was getting near the same results as I. Holger Isenberg wasn't, Steve Wingate wasn't, (In fact he only seems interesting in debunking this image, which sadly he has looked very foolish doing) Richard wasn't. No one that tried did. The best attempts I saw from others were rather streaked and the color values were smudged, weak, with high noise levels. Not very good examples of true false color multispectral images worthy of the capabilities of the wonderful THEMIS, which for the most part are supposed to be clean and colorful where there are thermal and compositional differences being imaged..

The reason for this became apparent when I went back to the THEMIS site on August 26th. I found that the image now there is very different from the one I downloaded on July 25th. I could not believe it. This image was much "prettier." This was obviously not the same one that Noel just described as having blocks. In comparison, it looks very much like a visible image. This was the reason why the others were not getting the same results. I for some reason had a different image. Somehow, This is strange because the only source for that image on July 25th would have been the THEMIS site. No doubt my image came from there. This is further confirmed by comparing the official present image with what Noel described to me above. The block effect is not noticeable on the ratio images made from the "official" image, it is not evident in the individual band images from it either, yet it is in both on the image that I got, just as described.

These "blocks" are in no way a result of any further processing that I have done on the parent image, these were on the image the day I got it. I have done slight processing work on my original dated file download image and saved it. Nothing destructive, and for the simple reason of trying to lessen the severity of the blocks while comparing it to the different clear image from the THEMIS site at present. This was on Aug 26th as evidenced by the modified file date. Original copies were made and saved from it beforehand, and all the work and ratios I have for the color multispectral images were made from it beforehand as well. I did this quite inadvertently, but because the processes done on it are necessary and compatible for what processes are being done to the image to make quality multispectral images that is of little consequence. A lot of people have done a lot of torture processes on the image to try to discredit it's pedigree, **but as of yet no one including myself has been able to replicate it using the image that is at the THEMIS site now.**

I have so far processed nearly every possible band ratio combination from my downloaded image, the "official" THEMIS page image of the present, and the other separate version from an associate obtained independently that is very similar to the one I downloaded. Without exception, and in every band combination tried, the version I got on July 25th is superior both in color data levels and clarity.

The Official image at the THEMIS site is in fact a prettied up, heavily destreaked, and warp registered later version of the image I received. This is extremely important, because my image has no hints of destreaking or warp registration. Both of these are irreversible processes. There is no way I could have made my image from the version now at the THEMIS website. Not even had I wanted to. The inferior looking image produces superior multispectrals. That's all there is to it.

I challenge ANY image processor to counter the conclusions I have made comparing these images.

The image data also confirms somewhat that this image is valid. Clearly in the header of my image, (Which is a tiff) and unalterable by any method I know was the identifier. My image is labeled as a II* $\partial\mu$ F Standard converted PNM file. The tiff image now available at the THEMIS site is headered with this label. II* d ∂ z. The GIF was labeled GIF, the png was labeled png, and the jpeg was labeled jiff. Might I remind any that PNM is a standard raw satellite data transferal format?

There have been many to attempt to "debunk" this image. No one has, and I have a good hunch no one ever will.

It is plain faulty analysis to take an image and subject it to overtly data torturous nonsense processes designed only to fake a claim that it's a fake based on the observations of said overprocessing steps. The only true way to analyze this image is to process all the data sets and compare. All else is foolhardy supposition using an array of dubious practices for ascertainment.. Nonsense in other words.

Where did I get this image? From ASU's THEMIS site. No speculation needed. What did I do to this image? Nothing in any way image destructive. I will stand before all and defend my stance on this. Perhaps I was "bamfed" to where the real picture was kept? I do know this, somehow I obtained an unaltered tiff image with a different header identifier which produces superior IR multispectrals over and beyond the presently displayed and original July 24th image release. Having looked at some of the example images and visible overlays both on my site and The Enterprise Mission you might come to the same conclusion. Personally, I think they are fantastic, opening up an entire new era in Mars exploration. To whatever white hat at ASU, JPL, NAS, or wherever that made this possible, I deeply thank you. I also curse you for being a tremendous coward. Stand up for the truth. You have done far more than you will probably ever get credit for, but then again, based upon your actions you really deserve none.

Keith Laney"
END of testimony.

Clearly, Mr. Keith Laney's testimony above not only describes in detail how he acquired his downloaded data from NASA, but also describes a complex set of communications between an important researcher named Noel Gorelick from within the ASU imaging department in a direct association with NASA. This accompaniment of official advice adds to the process of dissemination and must be included in the consideration of integrity for data for this circumstance.

We wish that the Data Quality officer e-mail all responses to Keith Laney at bullitt@carolina.rr.com (telephone 704-573-6144) with CC to Richard Hoagland; rr1947@yahoo.com and Francis Knize; frankknee@aol.com (203 544-9603)

Mr. Hoagland has indicated he will provide the documentary evidence upon request, which is a record kept of the headers attached to each download. Apparently the download headers indicate a difference of data size as well as other attributes.

Should NASA maintain that the data Mr. Laney claims to have received could not have come from a NASA source, then this should be considered a point of need for inspection rather than denial of inspection. An open Panel must then analyze how the elements of Mr. Laney's frame relates to the original as posted at the NASA site. Only then can it be properly determined how data was received by Mr. Laney, and disseminated by NASA

We request that a panel for peer review be set up consisting of members from both inside and outside of NASA to determine why data does not seem transparent and, additionally, the process and mode for dissemination not transparent. This is according to original OMB guidelines for data quality. A review

conducted solely from the inside of the agency could be considered a continuance of prejudicial treatment in determining integrity. A fair proceeding would include agreement from imaging professionals from both inside and outside the agency. The selection must include recognized scientists previously involved in anomalies study as well as having credentials in image analysis. Open peer review status would be according to the original Data Quality Act determinations of which the NASA guidelines should be encompassing. Judgments need to include the opinions of well-established scientists who have centered on SETI study of which NASA has little inkling and knowledge, since the agency has officially indicated that it has little interest today to pursue SETI Research in our Solar System.

NASA guidelines place upon affected parties to have a duty to explain where data should be corrected, but it must also be realized that this cannot be easily determined until a reexamination is conducted to see where possibly information was corrupted, or altered, as image data often holds levels of complexity that best wait for an appropriate scientific approach for clarification. If we as a combined group of affected interests had to explain where we would like to see a correction in data take place, it would be in the correction to establish transparency of data, in other words that data would remain the same from the same NASA source for independent researchers who depend on consistency. This has clearly not been the case as depicted by the testimony above. A correction will occur when data is consistent, Mr. Laney's data for image frame was skewed when received. Mr. Laney's data contained a certain "blocking phenomenon" which appears not to be a result of photographic artifacting and pixilation, but rather to exhibit visual elements that are real. The aforementioned attributes were not contained in the image later showing at the same THEMIS source, which shows an inconsistency and unwarranted degradation in the official version now posted of the frame in question at the official NASA Internet site.

Please return notice as soon as possible concerning our Data Quality Act inquiry into NASA space probe imagery activities. The public anxiously awaits your reply.

Respectfully,

Francis C. P. Knize; producer

Keith Laney; independent researcher, Ames Research Center consultant

Richard Hoagland; science writer, author, science consultant

The Enterprise Mission; Space Research organization

SETI scientists from about the globe

72 percent of the American population