

I've been catching up on some reading. Here are links to a few interesting recent journal articles.

- Thomas Dietz, Gerald T. Gardner, Jonathan Gilligan, Paul C. Stern, and Michael P. Vandenbergh, Household Actions Can Provide a Behavioral Wedge to Rapidly Reduce U.S. Carbon Emissions, 106 PNAS 18452 (Nov. 3, 2009). The authors, including Vanderbilt law professor Vandenbergh, who in earlier writings has emphasized the need for climate change policy to address individual behavior as well as industrial emissions, argue that a range of policy tools combined with “strong social marketing” could produce a 20% reduction in U.S. household greenhouse gas emissions, equivalent to a 7.4% reduction in total U.S. emissions, within ten years at relatively low cost and “with little or no reduction in household well-being.” ([abstract](#)) ([open-access pdf](#))
- Janet A. Nye, Jason S. Link, Jonathan A. Hare, William J. Overholtz, Changing Spatial Distribution of Fish Stocks in Relation to Climate and Population Size on the Northeast United States Continental Shelf, 393 Marine Ecology Progress Series 111 (Oct. 30, 2009). They find that 24 of the 36 northeastern US (Georges Bank to the mid-Atlantic) stocks assessed showed statistically significant distributional shifts associated with large-scale warming from 1968 to 2007. Shifts included moves poleward and to increased depth. Total range expanded for some stocks, and contracted for others. They conclude, not surprisingly, that fisheries managers will need to factor climate change into their calculations. Studies like this can help make that consideration feasible. ([abstract](#)) ([full text pdf \(subscription required\)](#))
- Joseph E. Fargione, Thomas R. Cooper, David J. Flaspohler, Jason Hill, Clarence Lehman, Tim McCoy, Scott McLeod, Erik J. Nelson, Karen S. Oberhauser, and David Tilman, Bioenergy and Wildlife: Threats and Opportunities for Grassland Conservation, 59 BioScience 767 (Oct. 2009). This paper documents the growth of corn ethanol production in the U.S. and its potential impacts on wildlife. But the authors don't stop there. They suggest that bioenergy production can be much more compatible with wildlife, through the use of biomass wastes and wildlife-friendly native grasses. The authors are not blind enthusiasts; they note the ways in which various energy crops may conflict with wildlife, and suggest a research program and general policy approaches to promoting wildlife-friendly bioenergy. ([abstract available here](#)) ([full text pdf \(subscription required\)](#))