



517.740.4606
517.782.6529
esp@core.com

2322 Marshwood Drive
Jackson Michigan 49203

Mr. Emmett Brown, Record Review Committee, Board of Directors
Fresh Water Fishing Hall of Fame
P.O Box 690
10360 Hall of Fame Drive
Hayward, Wisconsin 54843

February 02, 2006

RE: Review of the Hall's Decision to Uphold the Louis Spray World Record Musky

Dear Sirs and Madam:

In previous correspondence (01/08/03 & 10/26/05) I urged the Hall to recognize all Historic Angling Records and to establish a closely scrutinized Modern Angling Records Program. When it became apparent that the Hall would continue to disqualify angling records established by other sanctioning bodies, I urged the establishment of a consistent "disqualification protocol" (12/11/05). Further, I recommended that the Hall's consideration of the World Record Muskie Alliance (WRMA) protest of Mr. Spray's world record musky be technically sound and carefully presented. I suggested the utilization of Advisory Governors and outside expertise to assist with the review of the record protest and provided an independent evaluation and advice regarding Mr. Spray's musky (12/16 & 12/19/05). Although the Hall considered me a "research expert" when the Lawton and Malo muskies were evaluated, my input regarding the Spray musky was ignored. In fact, for the most part, my efforts were never formally acknowledged and the extent of the distribution of my correspondence among the Board members remains unknown to me.

When the Hall's contempt for the WRMA became apparent, I submitted an independent protest of Mr. Spray's record (12/18/05). I subsequently withdrew my protest believing that my ideas would be considered to help evaluate the WRMA's protest (12/25/05). They weren't.

After gut-wrenching contemplation, my disagreement with the Hall's arrogance and demeanor regarding the world records program led to my resignation as Advisory Governor (12/22/05 and 01/03/06). Subsequently, I was advised by the Hall that I could not serve as Chairman of the Awards Committee because I was no longer an Advisory Governor (01/01/06). Accordingly, I advised the Awards Committee of the Hall's decision (01/08/06 and 01/16/06).

Recently the Hall issued a Press Release upholding the Spray record. The release is blatantly biased and clearly exhibits the Hall's contempt for the WRMA. It is extremely unprofessional and technically incompetent. The Hall's review of the Spray musky is reminiscent of a poorly written high school science term paper. It is an embarrassment to the Hall and should be an embarrassment to the Hall's membership. I'll elaborate.

Sworn Statements and Affidavits

The Hall makes a point that the Spray record includes strong documentation supporting the size of the Spray muskie. The Hall ignores the fact that similar strong supporting documentation, accredited by esteemed Field & Stream review committees, supported former world record fish that have been disqualified by the Hall, notably; the Lawton musky and the Mabry walleye.

The Hall contends that the WRMA's report is essentially an accusation of fraud toward six different individuals. Frankly, that is not true. The WRMA's report indicates fraud by Mr. Spray and Mr. Lackey regarding Spray's 1949 world record and Mr. Spray and Mr. Kahmann regarding the 1939 and 1940 muskies. This fraud was inadvertently supported by the Spray witnesses.

A.J. McClane, Dr. H. John Rayner, Cecil Heacox, Van Campen Heilner, Bill Rea, Paul Martin, Louis Hauf Jr., Robert Riley, J. Emerson Sharp, Lauren Kisselburg, Walter Dunn, Dale Shaw, Pinkerton Detective Agency, L. Robert Crandell, Harry D. Heinzerling, Al Messner, Warren Flood.....who are these people? This is a PARTIAL list of the people that were either discredited or called liars, along with Art and Ruth Lawton.....and the families and friends of each, when the Lawton muskie was disqualified. I imagine a similar list could be constructed regarding the Mabry walleye.

Scientific Method

As stated in the Hall's review, the WRMA report used scientific methodology to arrive at their various calculated results and conclusions. The Hall contends that the WRMA failed to follow the scientific method.

The Hall's contention is an embarrassment. In fact, the scientific method is the principle that guides scientific research and experimentation. The WRMA's report, specifically efforts by DCM Technical Services Inc., is neither scientific research nor experimentation. It is the application of scientific technology to provide a technical assessment of the length of Mr. Spray's musky. Scientific technology was also applied to assess the Spray mounts, which I did not personally assess and is not a part of these comments.

The Hall exacerbates their professional embarrassment and technical incompetence by referring to the use of a least squares photogrammetric solution, a scientific technology that has been peer reviewed in scientific journals, as an experiment that must include a controlled experiment to provide reliable answers.

In the case of DCM's Photogrammetric Solutions Report, a controlled experiment is clearly not necessary to test the reliability of results. The PhotoModeler methodology has been validated and is beyond reproach. The hypothesis that the PhotoModeler can accurately calculate the measurement of an unknown object using valid methods that include the proper use of variables and an acceptable margin of error has been established.

The technician responsible for the assessment of Mr. Spray's muskie is a recognized expert in his field. The assumptions that were made to provide input to the PhotoModeler software program were part of a peer review. The Hall was urged to seek an independent photogrammetric evaluation and/or to commission a second peer review of the photogrammetric solution if they felt that an assessment of the application of this state-of-the-art technology was warranted. This advice was ignored and in its place the Hall doggedly pursued a campaign to support the Spray record, ignoring their obligation to carefully consider the WRMA's protest.

In pursuit of support of the Spray musky, in addition to ignoring DCM's results, the Hall chose to ignore all evidence that did not support Mr. Spray. Examples of dismissed evidence include an evaluation provided to the Hall at their request by Professor Douglas Arnold, Director of the Institute for Mathematics and its Application, University of Minnesota. Professor Arnold offered, "It is not possible to estimate the size of the fish from the photo....we can only give the upper bound on the size of the fish...the fish is shorter than 63", perhaps considerably so." Professor Arnold's upper bound estimate, before consideration of perspective (which would further reduce the estimate of the fish's size), assumes that Mr. Spray's image in the photograph represents a 72" individual (height information was provided to Professor Arnold by the Hall). My evaluation, based on a more realistic estimate of 71" for Mr. Spray's height, provides an upper bound of 62 ¼" before consideration of perspective. It was likewise dismissed. In addition, the Hall ignored follow up electronic correspondence by Professor Arnold that, "In particular, my conclusion, that the fish is certainly shorter than 63" and perhaps considerably so is consistent with the DCM statement that the length is 53.6 inches plus or minus 1.5 inches." [Note that the recorded length of Mr. Spray's musky is 63 ½ inches.]

In an effort to support Mr. Spray's musky, the Hall conducted a controlled experiment that is laughable, at best. Using 21st century camera technology, the Hall's "experiment" illustrates that same plane/direct scaling can be moderately accurate when the fish plane and film plane are parallel. Unfortunately, the controlled experiment **does not** address the geometry and camera technology present in the case of the Spray muskie where the musky angles out of the plane normal to the camera negative.

Professional Etiquette

When the Hall's Review Committee requested an analysis of a photograph of Mr. Spray and his musky by Professor Douglas Arnold, they provided a newly discovered photograph of the Spray musky; a photograph with a superimposed background. The Hall did not share with the Professor the nature of their request or DCM's Photogrammetric Solution Report or my review of Mr. Spray's musky. The Hall did not reveal that the background in the photo provided to Professor Arnold was false.

The photograph provided to Professor Arnold does not allow perspective analysis in contrast with the photos analyzed in the DCM Photogrammetric Solution Report. Subsequently, when Professor Arnold obtained the DCM report, he was concerned that he had been deceived. I assured him in writing that the Hall's oversight was inadvertent and was likely based on the Hall's inability to understand and assimilate the technical data and concepts necessary for photogrammetric analysis.

Unfortunately, my review of the Hall's recent Press Release indicates that the Hall's lack of professional etiquette may have been repeated in contacts with Professors Higgins, Brown, Gallian and Goldfeld. Each of these esteemed professionals has been placed in an awkward position by the Hall's amateurish treatment of the Spray world record protest.

Specifically, were Professor Higgins and Brown provided the Photogrammetric Solutions report? If not, they are unaware that the strength of the vanishing points that they were asked to comment on were a part of DCM's peer reviewed report. They are also unaware that the PhotoModeler software's is unable to calculate an estimate unless two reliable vanishing points are established.

Likewise, were Professors Gallian and Goldfeld provided DCM's report? If not, they are unaware that a least squares evaluation technology, documented in peer reviewed professional journals, was utilized to determine the length of Mr. Spray's musky. The peer reviewed results of the photogrammetric solution of the length of Mr. Spray's musky determined that the photo images Professors Gallian and Goldfeld reviewed are not normal to the film plane and the top of the fish is definitely slanted away from the camera's film plane since the fish is essentially vertical but the camera is downhill pointing up. In other words, were the Professors aware that the same plane/direct scaling evaluation that the Hall requested was in direct conflict with the photogrammetric solution? Were they advised that the photogrammetric solution provided a length determination of 53.6 inches, plus or minus 1.5 inches?

The Hall has irresponsibly taken the replies of the Professors and Mr. Mills out of context. It is unconscionable to imply that the Professor's same plane/direct scale methodology is superior to a least squares photogrammetric solution. It is incompetent for the Hall to dismiss DCM's report then select measurement locations determined by the dismissed technology and solicit independent use of these measurements by the Professors. In fact, the measurement interval derived from DCM's report and provided to the Professors was also misrepresented by the Hall!

The Hall's Bias

The Hall has the responsibility to address a formal record protest in an unbiased manner regardless of personal animosity or conflicts of interest. The Hall steadfastly and arrogantly refused to secure an independent review of the Photogrammetric Solutions Report. Instead, the Hall took the position that the Spray record was valid and attempted to prove this assumption; that is bias. In local newspaper interviews before the protest vote, Executive Director Brown tried to discredit the WRMA protest; that is bias.

The Hall's treatment of Mr. Spray's height for image proportion comparisons assumes a height of 6-feet. Mr. Spray's medical records document a height of 5'11". The Hall insists on assuming that Mr. Spray's height was determined without shoes. This point is clearly an unknown. The Hall insists on adding an inch to Mr. Spray's height based on the height of his fishing boot heel, however; no data are provided to compare measurements with and without the boot (which the Hall has in its possession). Importantly, the Hall gives no consideration to the fact that height measurements are taken with feet together and head straightly aligned with the spine in contrast to the reduced height that would occur when Mr. Spray's head is cocked and his feet are spread off-center as in his photographs with muskies. These all are examples of bias that favors Mr. Spray.

The Hall's review, using the newly discovered photograph, includes a discussion of a missing jaw. This claim is simply ludicrous. The proportion of top to bottom jaw based on a mount of Mr. Spray's world record musky is provided in the WRMA report as 5.11 units for the upper jaw length versus 7.56 units for the lower jaw. This proportion closely matches the jaw measurement proportions in the photo analyzed in Section VI of the Hall's report. There is no basis for the measurements labeled "B" and "C" in this Section. This assessment is also clearly biased.

Further, none of the Hall's measurement assessments recognize the length differential posed between the proper measurement of total length, required for the Field & Stream record application, and a length measurement taken from a fish hung by a rope. This apparent oversight is in Mr. Spray's favor.

Additional Photographic Evidence

The WRMA's protest questioned the legitimacy of Mr. Spray's musky. I would expect the Hall to analyze all available information in an attempt to respond to the WRMA. In my opinion the Hall fell short of this responsibility.

Specifically, during the course of the Hall's review, a new photo of Mr. Spray and his musky was discovered. This photo brought attention to the fact that other than an obscure, grainy, newspaper photo of Mr. Spray and his musky, only one original photograph of the world record fish exists and, this picture was taken with Mr. Spray on an incline standing behind a fish that is suspended by a rope. The photographer is clearly below Mr. Spray and his musky.

Mr. Spray also submitted world record applications to Field & Stream for two other muskies. In Mr. Spray's 149 page book published in 1979 only one picture is provided for each fish. In each, the fish is held well out in front of the angler and the photographer was obviously well below the musky. To date there is still only one known photograph of Mr. Spray's 1939 musky (and Mr. Spray isn't even holding it). In recent years Hall president Dettloff published a book about Mr. Spray which included additional photos of Mr. Spray's 1940 musky....photos analyzed in the WRMA report and found to be less than the musky's reported length before the application of perspective!

In addition, the newly discovered photo of Mr. Spray and his musky is the same image as one of the two images provided to the WRMA for analysis, however; the image provided to the WRMA is a cropped enlargement of the newly discovered photograph. The cropped enlargement provides the illusion of a much larger musky. The original of this photo has not surfaced.

All of the photographs of Mr. Spray and his muskies are relevant to the determination of the legitimacy of Mr. Spray's musky because, if a person is caught cheating in a contest, all of his records are disqualified!

Conclusion

Recent newspaper quotes from the Hall that the photogrammetric solutions report is "bad science" is not only unprofessional, it reinforces the Hall's position of arrogance and ignorance. The Hall is responsible for the only "bad science" that has been practiced in regard to the Spray record. The Hall's decision regarding the Louie Spray world record is not technically sound and has placed the Hall's 35 years of credibility and integrity in serious jeopardy.

I urge a complete evaluation of the Hall's world record review protocol and either the immediate disqualification of Mr. Spray's musky or an independent assessment of the Louis Spray world record protest. Be advised, however; that an independent assessment will most likely support disqualification.

Last, but clearly not least, the Hall owes apologies to Mr. Mills, Professor Arnold, Professors Brown, Gillian, Goldfeld & Higgins, Mr. Ramsell and many more.

Sincerely,

Brad Latvaitis (517) 782-6529

Cc: Hall Board of Directors

Professor Arnold

Professor Brown

Professor Gallian

Professor Goldfeld

Professor Higgins

Mr. Dan Mills

Mr. Larry Ramsell

Mr. Richard Delaney