

---

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Duke Univ. Marcellus Study

Re: Duke Univ. Marcellus Study

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2011/5/12 10:21:06

URL:

Quote:

Don't forget that only recently the industry was denying that their drilling caused the problems at Dimock.

True, but I think every 3rd party observer knew the truth on that one. Maybe not the method, but that it was related to drilling. Other than the industry reps, noone really defended them on it. I think even the courts, weren't they forced to pay damages there?

Quote:

The Duke study isn't likely to be perfect, or the last word because there will probably be a lot more studies in the near future. But I wouldn't be so quick to say that it is just a "political" document, as some have said.

Agreed, and even the researchers said as much. That's why I hate MSM articles about science. Issues like this, every study gives you a snippet of info, but only after 50 or 100 such studies does the picture start to get a little clearer. These studies are not final conclusions, rather, they're a method of conversation among scientists. You can't say a single study is garbage, it's just a very small part of the whole discussion. But the media and political sides tend to take a single study and run with it as the gospel, when that's never what the scientists intended.

Likewise, as a scientist myself, I'm not going to sit here and say that there was intentional bias or anything here. It is what it is, these guys set out to test for contamination near gas wells. They started too late to get "before" measurements, they probably didn't get permission to test in as many places as they'd like. They ended up getting valid measurements on 4 or 5 wells. And they found that 1 of them was indeed contaminated. Not only that, but they essentially proved that the contamination was due to drilling activity. Not bad for one paper.

1 in 4 or 5 isn't enough to make a statistical conclusion when there are 1000's of wells out there. From the data, an overall rate of 1 in 2 or 1 in 10,000 are still possible. But getting actual valid statistical conclusions in a situation like this is a job way too big for 1 study. Another group will copy the study on 4 or 5 more wells, then another on 4 or 5 more, and eventually you collectively have a decent amount of data where maybe you can make some statistical conclusions.