ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
LETTERS

CORRIGENDUM • OPEN ACCESS

The greenhouse impact of unconventional gas for electricity generation

To cite this article: Nathan Hultman *et al* 2011 *Environ. Res. Lett.* **6** 049504

Environ. Res. Lett. **6** (2011) 049504 (1pp) doi:10.1088/1748-9326/6/4/049504

Corrigendum

The greenhouse impact of unconventional gas for electricity generation
Nathan Hultman, Dylan Rebois, Michael Scholten and Christopher Ramig 2011 *Environ. Res. Lett.* **6** 044008

Received 15 November 2011
Published 15 December 2011

In our discussion of the use of global warming potential (GWP) values in the Howarth *et al* (2011) paper, our text implies that the GISS group's 2009 and 2010 papers (Shindell *et al* 2009 and Unger *et al* 2010) were contradictory. Such an interpretation does not reflect the conclusions of those papers and was not our intention. First, the 2009 and 2010 papers address GWP and radiative forcing, respectively. Our intentions in that paragraph were (a) to illustrate the possible ways that the GWP and radiative forcing discussions in the scientific community were misapplied to lifecycle analysis of greenhouse gas emissions from unconventional gas extraction, and (b) to underscore that the reasonable questions about GWP raised by Shindell *et al* (2009) are a justification for retaining a broader, rather than narrower, range of GWP possibilities for this calculation.

References

Howarth R W, Santoro R and Ingraffea A 2011 Methane and the greenhouse-gas footprint of natural gas from shale formations *Clim. Change Lett.* **106** 679–90

Shindell D T, Faluvegi G, Koch D M, Schmidt G A, Unger N and Bauer S E 2009 Improved attribution of climate forcing to emissions *Science* **326** 716–8

Unger N, Bond T C, Wang J S, Koch D M, Menon S, Shindell D T and Bauer S E 2010 Attribution of climate forcing to economic sectors *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **107** 3382–7

