



# COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY PRESIDENTS

1155 16th Street, NW • Washington, DC 20036 • 202-872-4452 • FAX 202-872-4079

## 2010 EXECUTIVE BOARD

### President

Martin A. Apple  
Washington DC 20036-4892  
mapple@sciencepres.org

### Chair

Arthur Bienenstock  
AMERICAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY  
Stanford University  
Stanford CA 94305-2055  
arthurb@stanford.edu

### Chair-Elect

George B. Corcoran  
SOCIETY OF TOXICOLOGY  
Wayne State University  
Detroit MI 48202-3489  
corcoran@wayne.edu

### Past Chair

William F. Carroll, Jr.  
AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY  
Occidental Chemical Corporation  
Dallas TX 75244-6100  
bill\_carroll@oxy.com

### Secretary

Sabine U. O'Hara  
US SOCIETY FOR ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS  
Council for the Int'l Exchange of  
Scholars  
Washington DC 20008-3009  
sohara@cies.ife.org

### Treasurer

John M. (Jack) Sharp, Jr.  
GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS—AUSTIN  
Austin, TX 78712-0254  
jmsharp@mail.utexas.edu

### Past Treasurer

James G. Glimm  
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY  
SUNY—University at Stony Brook  
Stony Brook NY 11794-3600  
glimm@ams.sunysb.edu

## Members-at-Large

Thomas L. Bohan  
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FORENSIC SCIENCES  
MTC Forensic  
Peaks Island, ME 04108  
tbohan2@maine.rr.com

Deborah A. Bronk  
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF LIMNOLOGY AND  
OCEANOGRAPHY  
College of William and Mary  
Gloucester Point, VA 23062  
bronk@vims.edu

Richard A. Duschl  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RESEARCH IN  
SCIENCE TEACHING  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802  
rad19@psu.edu

Joseph F. Franciscio  
AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
francisc@purdue.edu

Ralph B. James  
SPIE-INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR OPTICS AND  
PHOTONICS  
BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY  
Upton, NY 11973  
rjames@bnl.gov

Legal/Ethics Advisor  
Judge Haskell Pfluck  
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FORENSIC SCIENCES  
Crystal Lake IL 60014  
pfluck@mc.net

May 4, 2010

**We represent the leadership of over 1.4 million scientists in over 150 scientific disciplines.**

**The acceleration of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from human activity is increasingly leading to harmful climate change and ocean acidification. Societies must act urgently to reduce these emissions to protect the life-sustaining biophysical systems of the Earth. As noted by DoE Secretary Steven Chu in his April 28, 2010 testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, the necessary transition: "will require nothing short of a new industrial revolution." We agree with this assessment of the scale of response needed. We need to work aggressively to conserve energy and increase the efficiency of energy use, and we need rapidly to develop less polluting energy systems. Objective science has a critical role to play, and we urge that the nation fully use and incorporate the best available science in designing and implementing the energy and environmental policies necessary to guide the revolution.**

**America should move ahead quickly to develop a comprehensive energy policy to greatly reduce our GHG emissions. We urge that any potential approach be first evaluated in terms of the net benefits on environmental integrity, including a full analysis of GHG emissions, recognized by the Supreme Court as air pollutants, as well as other environmental concerns. The analysis of GHG emissions should include indirect land use effects and emissions of methane and nitrous oxide as well as carbon dioxide. No policy should be implemented without a full understanding of the consequences on the environment. Uncertainties will remain, which points to the necessity of also having the ability to reverse a policy action if unintended consequences are discovered.**

**Some energy bridges that are currently encouraged in the transition away from GHG-emitting fossil energy systems have received inadequate scientific analysis before implementation, and these may have greater GHG emissions and environmental costs than often appreciated. We find that their environmental impact studies and EPA determinations necessary to proceed are absent or inadequate. These include the production of ethanol from corn, where recent, more inclusive research concludes this is a poor option. As scientists we are concerned about the impact of the ethanol scale-up on water supply and quality, land use, GHG emissions, and net energy gain. In 2007, the nation used 27% of its corn harvest to produce 1.3% of total liquid fuels. One unintended result is greater nutrient flows down the Mississippi River, aggravating the ecological disaster underway in the Gulf of Mexico. Other biomass feedstocks produce more energy from less land, with less environmental harm. A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences lists many topics that deserve further scientific scrutiny before the nation further expands the role of ethanol as a fuel.**

**The production of natural gas (methane) from shales represents a major new domestic energy resource that can reduce reliance on imported crude oil. However, the development of methane from shale formations is another example where policy has preceded adequate scientific study. Economic recovery of methane from shales requires the drilling of long-reach horizontal wells and the high-pressure injection of millions of gallons of water with chemical additives to release the gas through a process called hydrofracking. Despite the utilization of millions of gallons of water and the flow back to the surface of these injected fluids, hydrofracking is exempted from the Clean Water Act. Exploitation of the Marcellus Shale Formation in the Appalachian basin, recognized as the largest shale-gas reserve in the U.S., could occur across a five-state region. Prior, thorough science-based studies are required to evaluate the impact of massive shale development on rural land uses, water supply and quality, and full-life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions.**

Sincerely,