

HFReview

From: _____
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 2:33 PM
To: HFReview
Subject:

Dear Margo ,

This is my submission to the previous frac'ing review . It's a bit out of date . It may be useful for background

Thanks You again
Geoffrey May

From: MacDonald - May
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 11:54 AM
To: frac-review@gov.ns.ca ; [Allan MacMaster](#) ; [Andrew Younger MLA](#) ; [Darrel Dexter](#)
Subject:

To Whom It May Concern,

The Council of Scientific Society Presidents—which represents 1.4 million scientists from more than 150 scientific disciplines - reported to the Obama administration in May 2010, “some energy bridges that are currently encouraged in the transition 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.” The development of unconventional gas from shale deposits, the Council warns, is an “example where policy has preceded adequate scientific study.”

This warning delivered over a year ago to the US President, should have attracted some attention in Nova Scotia, as it demolishes the baseless assumptions contained in the Provincial Energy Plan, that natural gas is a “transitional” fuel to a low carbon future. This assumption was never based on science, but rather, only a PR pitch from the fossil fuel industry. It is truly appalling that the absurd ideas forwarded by T. Boone Pickens, and a morally bankrupt fossil fuel industry would have been accepted as gospel with the government departments charged with preventing the exact sorts of damage that is part and parcel of unconventional natural gas development.

The entire shale gas industry has been based on simplistic, obviously flawed assumptions, which North American regulators should have recognized. Sadly it is not the only false assumption of this industry, it is however the key to the industry's success in turning governments into co-conspirators with industry against the interests of their citizens and our environment. What was clear to science in May of 2010, received empirical support with the publication of the Robert Howarth Study, published in the peer review journal Climatic Change Letters. <http://www.eeb.cornell.edu/howarth/Howarth%20et%20al%20%202011.pdf>. The Howarth study comes shortly after the US EPA doubled its estimates for escaping methane from hydraulic fracturing operations, and shows that cradle to grave, unconventional sources of natural gas have 20% greater impact on climate than burning coal. The lie that it is a bridge fuel is now clear as day, unconventional gas is a bridge to nowhere.

Another peer reviewed science journal, The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences published a study by Stephen Osborn et al. Duke University <http://www.pnas.org/content/108/20/8067>. Beyond showing a direct correlation between hydraulic fracturing and methane contamination of nearby (within 1 km) water wells, the fact that it occurs so routinely, shows that industry assumptions that leaks only happen from poor well construction are cast into disrepute. The study showed that the wells tested were contaminated with methane, and that the methane was NOT organic in nature, as industry shills bleat. The Duke study supports the