

**MPUC Docket No. E-6472-/M-05-1993**  
**OAH Docket No. 12-2500-17260-2**

---

BEFORE THE  
MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
100 Washington Square, Suite 1700  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401-2138

FOR THE  
MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
127 7th Place East, Suite 350  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2147

---

In the Matter of the Petition of Excelsior Energy Inc.  
and Its Wholly-Owned Subsidiary MEP-I, LLC For Approval of Terms and  
Conditions For The Sale of Power From Its Innovative Energy Project Using  
Clean Energy Technology Under Minn. Stat. § 216B.1694 and a  
Determination That the Clean Energy Technology Is Or Is Likely To Be a  
Least-Cost Alternative Under Minn. Stat. § 216B.1693

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF  
EXCELSIOR ENERGY INC.**

**Daniel P. Schrag**

**June 19, 2006**

---

1 EXCELSIOR ENERGY, INC.

2 BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3 PREPARED SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF

4 DANIEL P. SCHRAG

5 **Q Please state your name, current employment position and business address.**

6 A Daniel P. Schrag. I am Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences and  
7 Environmental Engineering in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences and the  
8 Division of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Harvard University in Cambridge  
9 Massachusetts. My business address is 20 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. My  
10 curriculum vitae is attached as Exhibit DPS-1 to this testimony.

11 **Q Would you please describe your educational and professional background?**

12 A I received my bachelors degree from Yale University in Geology & Geophysics  
13 and Political Science. I received my Ph.D. in Geology from the University of  
14 California at Berkeley. I was an Assistant Professor at Princeton University from 1993  
15 through 1997, and then an Associate Professor and Professor at Harvard University  
16 from 1997 through the present. I am a geochemist with expertise in climate and climate  
17 change, the carbon cycle, energy technology, and carbon sequestration. I have authored  
18 or co-authored over 70 scientific papers, have been honored with numerous awards  
19 including a MacArthur Fellowship in 2000. I receive my research funding from federal  
20 agencies including the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. I  
21 am Director of the Harvard University Center for the Environment, a university-wide  
22 program to integrate research and education across the many parts of Harvard including  
23 the Business School, the Law School, the Kennedy School, the School of Public Health,  
24 the Graduate School of Design, the Medical School, as well as Arts and Sciences. In

1 that capacity, I am leading the Harvard University Energy Initiative, which brings  
2 perspectives from all these different disciplines and others together to address questions  
3 about energy use, environmental consequences, national security, and economic  
4 development.

5 I have never worked with Excelsior Energy Inc. (“Excelsior”), and had never  
6 heard of the Mesaba Energy Project until I was contacted by officers of Excelsior a few  
7 weeks ago, who were interested in my perspective on carbon sequestration and  
8 advanced coal technologies.

9 **Q On whose behalf are you testifying?**

10 A I am testifying on behalf of Excelsior Energy Inc.

11 Scope and Summary

12 **Q What is the scope of your testimony in this proceeding?**

13 A The primary purpose of my testimony is to describe how advanced coal  
14 technologies such as Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) are important for  
15 mitigation of future climate change through the potential to capture carbon dioxide  
16 emissions and store them in geologic repositories. I am also testifying as an expert on  
17 climate change and climate change policy and on the likelihood that strict carbon  
18 regulations that require carbon capture and sequestration will be imposed during the  
19 lifetime of any coal-fired generating plant built today.

20 **Q Can you please briefly describe the global use of fossil fuels for energy production?**

21 A Yes. Energy is an essential element of modern society, with almost all  
22 economic activity intimately linked to its supply and utilization. The world obtains  
23 more than 80 percent of its energy from the combustion of fossil fuels including more  
24 than 85 million barrels of oil each day. The growth in oil demand over the next few

1 decades, driven by rapidly developing countries, could overwhelm world oil production.  
2 Demand for natural gas is also increasing faster than new discoveries, creating greater  
3 dependence on the hydrocarbon-rich regions of the world including Russia and the  
4 Middle East. Concerns about energy security have played a central role in geopolitical  
5 conflicts for more than a century, and the potential for future conflicts increasingly  
6 animates international tensions. Consequently, other sources of fossil fuels, especially  
7 coal and unconventional sources of oil such as tar sands, will begin to play a larger role.  
8 But the continued use of fossil fuel as the major source of world energy has ominous  
9 implications for future harmful impacts on the environment.

10 **Q: What are some of those implications?**

11 A: Current global consumption of fossil fuel releases almost 30 billion tons of  
12 carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. If current trends continue, and coal  
13 becomes even more important as a source of energy for the world, then atmospheric  
14 carbon dioxide will triple by the end of the century, bringing the Earth to an  
15 atmospheric composition not seen for more than 40 million years. Given the long  
16 lifetime of energy infrastructure, it is difficult to design even the most aggressive  
17 mitigation strategy to keep CO<sub>2</sub> from doubling, especially with large deposits of  
18 inexpensive coal in those countries that consume the most energy. There is no debate  
19 that the rise in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is warming the planet, nor that climate will continue to  
20 change over the next century. What remains uncertain is exactly how much the climate  
21 will change, what the impacts will be, how much they will cost, how these impacts  
22 might be avoided, and how much it will cost to avoid them. And climate is not the only  
23 way that fossil fuel consumption can affect societies and natural ecosystems. Various  
24 forms of water and air pollution from energy conversion and consumption are major

1 concerns for human health and the natural environment across the developing and  
2 developed world.

3 **Q: What are some of the reported observations of climate change?**

4 A: Over the last decade, signs of climate change have become more and more  
5 pronounced. The Arctic ice cap has thinned by more than 40%. Ice is melting from all  
6 of the tall mountain glaciers in the tropics. And recent studies have shown that the  
7 power dissipation by tropical cyclones (hurricanes) is strongly correlated with sea  
8 surface temperature, which will continue to rise with carbon dioxide concentrations.

9 **Q: Do you believe the United States will adopt some form of CO<sub>2</sub> regulation in the  
10 coming decade?**

11 A: Yes. Faced with all of these observations of a changing climate, as well as the  
12 risk of rapid and catastrophic change, such as the collapse of the Greenland Ice Sheet,  
13 which would raise sea level by more than 20 feet, many governments have taken steps  
14 to reduce carbon emissions. The United States has been slower than other developed  
15 countries in these steps for a variety of reasons too numerous to discuss here. The  
16 important point is that it is extremely likely that the United States will join the effort to  
17 reduce carbon dioxide emissions sometime over the next decade, perhaps even sooner.  
18 Several of the potential presidential candidates for the 2008 election from both parties  
19 have spoken out strongly for action on climate change, and there are several different  
20 bills being prepared in the Senate that appear to have increasing support. Exactly what  
21 will trigger the change in policy is difficult to predict; it could be a change in  
22 administration in the White House, a series of natural disasters that create a public cry  
23 for action, or simply a gradual shift in congressional leadership. But whatever the  
24 trigger, the change will affect all Americans through a change in the way energy prices

1 are calculated. We will be forced to pay for the true cost of fossil fuel, which includes  
2 its environmental consequences.

3 **Q: What has been the response of the private sector to these observations of climate**  
4 **change?**

5 A: Many companies have recognized that regulations that restrict the emission of  
6 carbon dioxide are a part of the future, and that steps can be taken today to minimize the  
7 impact of those regulations on future business practices. Investments in energy  
8 efficiency through advanced technologies, better building design, and other strategies  
9 are more and more common. But from the perspective of electricity generation, the  
10 choices are much more challenging.

11 **Q: Is it possible to develop an electricity generation strategy for the United States that**  
12 **does not use fossil fuels, and in particular coal?**

13 A: No. The problem is that renewable energies in general are much more  
14 expensive than fossil fuels, and most forms of renewable energy cannot be expanded  
15 rapidly, nor are they appropriate for replacing coal or gas power plants and still meeting  
16 our ever-growing energy demand. For example, the sun does not shine 24 hours per  
17 day, and current ways of storing electricity are inadequate. Moreover, the cost of  
18 electricity from photovoltaics is approximately four times as high as from coal  
19 combustion. Over time, better technologies may emerge and costs of renewables may  
20 decline, but for the foreseeable future, there is no substitute for fossil fuels, and coal in  
21 particular. *Coal is an essential source of energy for the US over the next 50 years. One*  
22 *cannot create an energy plan for the US without relying heavily on coal.*

1 **Q: How we can use coal to generate electricity without releasing carbon dioxide and**  
2 **other harmful pollutants into the air?**

3 A: We must capture the carbon dioxide and store it in various geologic repositories,  
4 which include deep saline aquifers in sedimentary basins, and marine sediments  
5 hundreds of meters below the ocean floor. There is a large research effort in the US on  
6 geologic storage of carbon dioxide, and many different strategies have been proposed.  
7 What is clear is that, although there are still some technical issues that must be solved  
8 that are specific to individual sites of carbon storage, the capacity to store tens of  
9 billions of tons of carbon dioxide per year does exist and is technically feasible.

10 **Q: What are the approaches to the capture of carbon emissions from power plants?**

11 A: How to capture carbon dioxide from the power plant itself is a more difficult  
12 engineering question. A super-critical, pulverized coal plant burns coal in air,  
13 producing a waste stream that is roughly 80% nitrogen and 20% carbon dioxide.  
14 Separating the carbon dioxide from the nitrogen is costly. Thus, the current stock of  
15 coal-fired power plants, that were not designed with carbon capture in mind may  
16 preclude carbon sequestration, or at least make it very expensive. An alternative  
17 approach is to build new forms of coal power plants that produce a concentrated  
18 effluent of carbon dioxide that is much easier to capture and store. The most common  
19 technology is IGCC, which has been built in a handful of locations around the world.  
20 The IGCC technology has several advantages. The efficiency of the generation is often  
21 higher than super critical plants, reducing the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emitted per unit of  
22 electricity produced. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> pollution is generally much lower (e.g., mercury),  
23 depending on the specific design of the plant, a fact that by itself creates significant  
24 public interest benefits in favor of IGCC as compared to super critical plants. But most

1 importantly, the IGCC plants can be retrofitted to include a “shift reaction” that  
2 essentially produces a concentrated effluent of carbon dioxide at relatively high  
3 pressures, all ready for piping to a geologic repository for storage. The capture of  
4 carbon in this case is not free, but is far less expensive than capture using a traditional  
5 pulverized coal design. The downside of the IGCC technology is that it is often slightly  
6 more expensive up front, although I understand from Excelsior Energy that certain  
7 federal incentives available to its Mesaba Project under the federal Energy Policy Act of  
8 2005 have significantly reduced the cost disparity one might expect between IGCC and  
9 traditional pulverized coal technologies. However, as I will discuss below, even  
10 without any federal incentives, the potential benefits of IGCC far outweigh the modest  
11 premium in capital cost.

12 **Q: What are the potential benefits of IGCC technology?**

13 A: It provides an unparalleled technological hedge (compared to super critical  
14 technologies) in the face of almost certain carbon regulations that will be put in place  
15 during the lifetime of any new power plant. No one knows exactly when carbon  
16 regulations will be put in place, or what those regulations will say. Some companies  
17 have decided to invest in traditional, pulverized coal plants because they are less  
18 expensive to build, and then to work towards making sure that the carbon regulations  
19 will be long in arriving. However, this may also mean that these plants will have to  
20 shut down if action on climate change occurs more quickly than anticipated. The  
21 investment in IGCC technology may be more expensive, but IGCC will provide a more  
22 stable price for electricity in the future as the cost of reducing carbon emissions, when  
23 carbon regulation does occur, will be much more manageable.

1 **Q: Should the companies that build IGCC plants be forced to put in the carbon**  
2 **capture technology today to make them truly “capture ready”?**

3 A: I think the answer to this is no. Such an investment does not make sense in  
4 advance of actual regulations controlling carbon dioxide emissions. The consumers  
5 would simply pay a higher price for electricity without any real benefit. Moreover, the  
6 Department of Energy is still working with various partners to develop the optimal  
7 capture technology for an IGCC plant, so waiting may result in better and cheaper  
8 designs. When the political will exists to regulate carbon at the level that carbon  
9 sequestration is economical, then fitting an IGCC plant with appropriate devices to  
10 capture the carbon should be relatively straightforward.

11 **Q: Why is it in the public interest to support IGCC projects like the Mesaba Project**  
12 **now?**

13 A: I often discuss issues of climate change and energy technology with financial  
14 groups including large investment banks. I believe they are becoming more and more  
15 convinced that their portfolios that include major energy projects must consider  
16 questions of future climate change and carbon regulation when making investment  
17 decisions as the time scale for some of these investments is several decades and they are  
18 being exposed to serious risks that they have not previously considered. The  
19 perspective of a State like Minnesota is somewhat different from an investment bank,  
20 but there are some similarities. The people of Minnesota are the ones who ultimately  
21 pay for the costs of bad investments in energy infrastructure through higher prices for  
22 electricity. Through the 80s and 90s, natural gas plants were built all over the US  
23 because gas was proclaimed to be abundant and cheap. But we have learned that these  
24 pronouncements were mistaken, and many of these power plants now sit idle as the

1 natural gas is too expensive to use in this way. The current situation with coal plants in  
2 this country is similar. Investment decisions are being made today for plants that will  
3 be used for the next 50 years or more. Investments that do not account for a future  
4 world with restrictions in carbon emissions are taking a huge risk that, like the natural  
5 gas plants, the technologies will not be flexible enough to accommodate new  
6 regulations and new prices. In my view it is absolutely imperative if we are to have any  
7 chance of controlling the increases in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the coming decades (much less  
8 achieving actual decreases in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) that the new fleet of coal-fueled power  
9 plants across the country utilize IGCC technology instead of traditional pulverized coal  
10 technologies.

11 **Q Does this conclude your prepared supplemental testimony?**

12 **A Yes.**

# **EXHIBITS**

**EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_ (DPS-1)**

**Resume**

# CURRICULUM VITAE

DANIEL P. SCHRAG

**Date of Birth:** January 25, 1966

**Education:**

B.S. 1988, Yale University (Geology & Geophysics and Political Science)

Ph.D. 1993, University of California at Berkeley (Geology)

**Ph.D. Dissertation Supervisors:**

Donald J. DePaolo (U.C. Berkeley)

Frank M. Richter (Univ. of Chicago)

**Post-Doctoral Supervisor:**

John M. Hayes (Indiana Univ.)

**Honors:**

James B. Macelwane Medal, American Geophysical Union (2001)

MacArthur Fellow (2000)

Technology Review TR100 – 100 young innovators for the next century (1999)

Ocean Drilling Program Fellowship (Berkeley) (1992)

Samuel Lewis Penfield Prize in Mineralogy (Yale) (1988)

Katherine K. Walker Prize in Political Science (Yale) (1988)

Frank M. Patterson Prize in Political Science (Yale) (1987)

Westinghouse Science Talent Search Finalist (1984)

**Professional Experience:**

Professor, Dept. of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 2000-  
Harvard University

Associate Professor, Dept. of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 1997-2000  
Harvard University

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Geosciences, Princeton University 1994 -1997

Visiting Researcher, Indiana University 1993

Geologist, Newmont Mining 1988

**Memberships:**

American Geophysical Union; Geochemical Society; American Meteorological Society;  
American Academy for the Advancement of Science; Canadian Institute for Advanced  
Research.

**Service:**

*Professional:* Board of Reviewing Editors, *Science* (2002 - 2005); Associate Editor,  
*Geochem.*, *Geophys.*, *Geosyst.* (1999 - ); Advisory Committee for Earth Institute of Columbia  
University (2002 - ).

*University:* University Center for the Environment (Director); Center for Geographic Analysis  
(Steering Committee); Committee on Oceanography; Board of Tutors for Environmental  
Science and Public Policy; Committee on Collections for Earth and Planetary Sciences;  
Faculty Advisory Committee on Affiliated Housing.

**Research Interests:**

Application of geochemistry to problems concerning the geologic record of climate change,  
history of the oceans and atmosphere, and interactions between the environment and life.

## Publications

1. Hoffman, D.L., L. Krupp, D. Schrag, G. Nilaver, G. Valiquette, M.M. Kilcoyne, and E.A. Zimmerman. Angiotensin immunoreactivity in vasopressin cells in rat hypothalamus and its relative deficiency in homozygous Brattleboro rat. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 394, 135-141, 1982.
2. Schrag, D.P., D.J. DePaolo, and F.M. Richter. Oxygen isotope exchange in a two-layer model of oceanic crust. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 111 (2-4), 305-317, 1992.
3. Schrag, D.P. and D.J. DePaolo. Determination of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  of seawater in the deep ocean during the last glacial maximum. *Paleoceanography*, 8 (1), 1-6, 1993.
4. Schrag, D.P., D. J. DePaolo, and F. M. Richter. Reconstructing past sea surface temperatures: Correcting for diagenesis of bulk marine carbonate. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 59 (11), 2265-2278, 1995.
5. Stoll, H.M. and D.P. Schrag. Glacial control of rapid sea level changes in the Early Cretaceous. *Science*, 272, 1771-1774, 1996.
6. Schrag, D.P., G. Hampt, and D.W. Murray. Pore fluid constraints on the temperature and oxygen isotopic composition of the glacial ocean. *Science*, 272, 1930-1932, 1996.
7. Moore, M.D., D.P. Schrag, and M. Kashgarian. Radiocarbon constraints on the source Indonesian seaway from coral AMS measurements. *JGR-Oceans*, 102, 12359-12365, 1997.
8. Rodgers, K.B., M.A. Cane, and D.P. Schrag. Seasonal variability of sea surface  $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$  in the equatorial Pacific in an ocean circulation model. *JGR-Oceans*, 102, 18627-18639, 1997.
9. Schrag, D.P., G. Hampt, and D.W. Murray. Oxygen isotopic composition of interstitial waters from ODP Leg 154: Determination of the temperature and isotopic composition of the glacial ocean, in *Proc. ODP, Sci. Results 154*, edited by N.J. Shackleton, W.B. Curry, C. Richter, and T.J. Bralower, Ocean Drilling Program, College Station, TX, 1997.
10. Gieskes, J.M., D.P. Schrag, L.-H. Chan, L. Zhang, and J. Murray. Geochemistry of interstitial waters, ODP Leg 152, in *Proc. ODP, Sci. Results 152*, edited by A.D. Saunders, H.C. Larsen, and S.W. Wise, Jr., Ocean Drilling Program, College Station, TX, 1998.
11. Stoll, H.M. and D.P. Schrag. Effect of quaternary sea level cycles on the Sr concentration of seawater. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 62 (7), 1107-1118, 1998.
12. Guilderson, T.P. and D.P. Schrag. Abrupt shift in subsurface temperatures in the Eastern Tropical Pacific associated with recent changes in El Niño. *Science*, 281, 240-243, 1998.
13. Hoffman, P.F., A.J. Kaufman, G.P. Galverson, and D.P. Schrag. A Neoproterozoic Snowball Earth. *Science*, 281, 1342-1346, 1998.
14. Guilderson, T.P., D.P. Schrag, M. Kashgarian, and J. Southon. Radiocarbon variability in the western equatorial Pacific inferred from a high-resolution coral record from Nauru Island. *JGR-Oceans*, 103, 24641-24650, 1998.
15. Schrag, D.P. Rapid determination of high-precision Sr/Ca ratios in corals and other marine carbonates. *Paleoceanography*, 14 (2), 97-102, 1999.
16. Guilderson, T.P. and D.P. Schrag. Reliability of coral isotope records from the western Pacific warm pool: A comparison using age-optimized records. *Paleoceanography*, 14 (4), 457-464, 1999.

17. Rodgers, K.B., M.A. Cane, N.H. Naik, and D.P. Schrag. The role of the Indonesian Throughflow in equatorial Pacific thermocline ventilation. *JGR-Oceans*, 104, 20551-20570, 1999.
18. Schrag, D.P. Effects of diagenesis on isotopic record of late Paleogene equatorial sea surface temperatures. *Chem. Geol.*, 161 (1-3), 215-224, 1999.
19. Stoll, H.M., D.P. Schrag, and S. Clemens. Are seawater Sr/Ca variations preserved in Quaternary foraminifera? *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 63 (21), 3535-3547, 1999.
20. Hughen, K.A., D.P. Schrag, S.B. Jacobsen, and W. Hantoro. El Niño during the last Interglacial recorded by fossil corals from Indonesia. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 26 (20), 3129-3132, 1999.
21. Hoffman, P.F. and D.P. Schrag. Response to comment by N. Christie-Blick, L. E. Sohl and M. J. Kennedy. *Science*, 284, 1087, 1999.
22. Hoffman, P.F. and D.P. Schrag. The Snowball Earth. *Sci. Am.*, 282 (1), 68-75, 1999.
23. Billups, K. and D.P. Schrag. Surface ocean density gradients during the Last Glacial Maximum. *Paleoceanography*, 15 (1), 110-123, 2000.
24. Stoll, H.M. and D.P. Schrag. High resolution stable isotope records from the Upper Cretaceous of Italy and Spain: Glacial episodes in a greenhouse planet? *Geol. Soc. Amer. Bull.*, 112 (2), 308-319, 2000.
25. Gagan, M.K., L.K. Ayliffe, J.W. Beck, J.E. Cole, E.R.M. Druffel, R.B. Dunbar, and D.P. Schrag. New views of tropical paleoclimates from corals. *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, 19 (1-5), 45-64, 2000.
26. Schrag, D.P. Of ice and elephants. *Nature*, 404, 23-24, 2000.
27. Eshel, G., D.P. Schrag, and B. F. Farrell. Troposphere - planetary boundary layer interactions and the evolution of surface density: Lessons from Red Sea corals. *J. Climate*, 13 (2), 339-351, 2000.
28. Stoll, H.M. and D.P. Schrag. Coccolith Sr/Ca as a new indicator of coccolithophorid calcification and growth rate. *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 1, Paper # 1999GC000015, 2000.
29. Rodgers, K.B., D.P. Schrag, M.A. Cane, and N.H. Naik. The bomb <sup>14</sup>C transient in the Pacific ocean. *JGR-Oceans*, 105, 8489-8512, 2000.
30. Guilderson, T.P., D.P. Schrag, E.A. Goddard, M. Kashgarian, G.M. Wellington, and B.K. Linsley. Southwest subtropical Pacific surface water radiocarbon in a high-resolution coral record. *Radiocarbon*, 42 (2), 249-256, 2000.
31. O'Brien, D.M., D.P. Schrag, and C. Martinez Del-Rio. Allocation to reproduction in a hawkmoth: A quantitative analysis using stable carbon isotopes. *Ecology*, 81 (10), 2822-2831, 2000.
32. Linsley, B.K., G.M. Wellington, and D.P. Schrag. Decadal sea surface temperature variability in the sub-tropical South Pacific (1726 to 1997 A.D.). *Science*, 290, 1145-1148, 2000.
33. Adkins, J.F. and D.P. Schrag. Pore fluid constraints on deep ocean temperature and salinity during the Last Glacial Maximum. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28 (5), 771-774, 2001.
34. Stoll, H.M. and D.P. Schrag. Sr/Ca variations in Cretaceous carbonates: Relation to productivity and sea level changes. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.*, 168 (3-4), 311-336, 2001.
35. Schrag, D.P. and P.F. Hoffman. Life, geology and Snowball Earth. *Nature*, 409, 306, 2001.

36. Druffel, E.R., S. Griffin, T.P. Guilderson, M. Kashgarian, J. Southon, and D.P. Schrag. Changes in subtropical North Pacific radiocarbon and their correlation with climate variability. *Radiocarbon*, 43 (1), 15-25, 2001.
37. Evans, M.N., M.A. Cane, D.P. Schrag, A. Kaplan, B.K. Linsley, R. Villalba, and G.M. Wellington. Support for tropically-driven Pacific decadal variability based on paleoproxy evidence. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28 (19), 3689-3692, 2001.
38. Schrag, D.P. and B.K. Linsley. Paleoclimate: Corals, chemistry, and climate. *Science*, 296, 277-278, 2002.
39. Schrag, D.P., J.F. Adkins, K. McIntyre, J.L. Alexander, D.A. Hodell, C.D. Charles, and J.F. McManus. The oxygen isotopic composition of seawater during the Last Glacial Maximum. *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, 21 (1-3), 331-342, 2002.
40. Milne, G.A., J.X. Mitrovica, and D.P. Schrag. Estimating past continental ice volume from sea-level data. *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, 21 (1-3), 361-376, 2002.
41. Billups, K. and D.P. Schrag. Paleotemperatures and ice-volume of the past 27 Myr revisited with paired Mg/Ca and  $^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O}$  measurements on benthic foraminifera. *Paleoceanography*, 17 (1), 3-1 - 3-11, 2002.
42. Kirk-Davidoff, D.B., D.P. Schrag, and J.G. Anderson. On the feedback of stratospheric clouds on polar climate. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 10, 1029-1032, 2002.
43. Hoffman, P.F. and D.P. Schrag. The Snowball Earth hypothesis: Testing the limits of global change. *Terra Nova*, 14 (3), 129-155, 2002.
44. Rickaby, R.E.M. and D.P. Schrag. Growth rate dependence of Sr incorporation during calcification of *Emiliana huxleyi*. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 16, No.1, 10.1029/2001GB001408, 2002.
45. Schrag, D.P. and J.J. McCarthy. Biological-physical interactions and global climate change: Some lessons from Earth history, in *The Sea*, vol. 12, edited by Allan R. Robinson, James J. McCarthy, and Brian J. Rothschild, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 605-619, 2002.
46. Halverson, G.P., P.F. Hoffman, D.P. Schrag, and A.J. Kaufman. A major perturbation of the carbon cycle before the Ghaub glaciation (Neoproterozoic) in Namibia: Prelude to Snowball Earth? *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 10, Paper #1029/2001GC000244, 2002.
47. Schrag, D.P., R.A. Berner, P.F. Hoffman, and G.P. Halverson. On the initiation of a Snowball Earth. *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 10, Paper #1029/2001GC000219, 2002.
48. Bard, E., G. Delaygue, F. Rostek, F. Antonioli, S. Silenzi, and D.P. Schrag. Hydrological conditions over the western Mediterranean basin during the deposition of the cold Sapropel 6 (ca. 175 kyr BP). *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 202 (2), 481-494, 2002.
49. Adkins, J.F., K. McIntyre, and D.P. Schrag. The salinity, temperature, and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  of the glacial deep ocean. *Science*, 298, 1769-1773, 2002.
50. Cochran, J.K., N.H. Landman, K.K. Turekian, A. Michard, and D.P. Schrag. Paleoceanography of the Late Cretaceous (Maastrichtian) Western Interior Seaway of North America: Evidence from Sr and O isotopes. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.*, 191 (1), 45-64, 2003.
51. Ren, L., B.K. Linsley, G.M. Wellington, D.P. Schrag, and O. Hoegh-Guldberg. Deconvolving the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{seawater}}$  component from subseasonal coral  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  and Sr/Ca at Rarotonga in the Southwestern Subtropical Pacific for the period 1726-1997. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 67 (9), 1609-1621, 2003.

52. Winter, A., A. Paul, J. Nyberg, T. Oba, J. Lundberg, D. Schrag, and B. Taggart. Orbital control of low-latitude seasonality during the Eemian. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30 (4), Art. No. 1163, 2003.
53. Higgins, J.A. and D.P. Schrag. Aftermath of a Snowball Earth. *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 4, Art. No. 1028, 2003.
54. Adkins, J.F. and D.P. Schrag. Reconstructing Last Glacial Maximum bottom water salinities from deep-sea sediment pore fluid profiles. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 216 (1-2), 109-123, 2003.
55. Patt, A.G. and D.P. Schrag. Using specific language to describe risk and probability. *Clim. Change*, 61 (1-2), 17-30, 2003.
56. Billups, K. and D.P. Schrag. Application of foraminiferal Mg/Ca ratios to questions of Cenozoic climate change. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 209 (1-2), 181-195, 2003.
57. Payne, J.L., D.J. Lehrmann, J.Y. Wei, M.J. Orchard, D.P. Schrag, and A.H. Knoll. Large perturbations of the carbon cycle during recovery from the end-Permian extinction. *Science*, 305, 506-509, 2004.
58. Linsley, B.K., G.M. Wellington, D.P. Schrag, L. Ren, M.J. Salinger, and A.W. Tudhope. Geochemical evidence from corals for changes in the amplitude and spatial pattern of South Pacific interdecadal climate variability over the last 300 years. *Clim. Dyn.*, 22 (1), 1-11, 2004.
59. Turchyn, A.V. and D.P. Schrag. Oxygen isotope constraints on the sulfur cycle over the past 10 million years. *Science*, 303, 2004-2007, 2004.
60. Guilderson, T., D. P. Schrag, and M.A. Crane. Surface water mixing in the Solomon Sea as documented by a high-resolution coral  $^{14}\text{C}$  record. *J. Climate*, 17 (5), 1147-1156, 2004.
61. Evans, M.N. and D.P. Schrag. A stable isotope-based approach to tropical dendroclimatology. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 68 (16), 3295-3305, 2004.
62. Scott, K.M., J. Schwedock, D.P. Schrag, and C.M. Cavanaugh. Influence of Form IA RubisCO and environmental dissolved inorganic carbon on the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of the clam-chemoautotroph symbiosis *Solemya Velum*. *Environ. Microbiol.*, 6 (12), 1210-1219, 2004.
63. Schrag, D.P. and R.B. Alley. Ancient lessons for our future climate. *Science*, 306, 821-822, 2004.
64. Rodgers, K.B., O. Aumont, G. Madec, C. Menkes, B. Blanke, P. Monfray, J.C. Orr, and D.P. Schrag. Radiocarbon as a thermocline proxy for the eastern equatorial Pacific. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31 (14), Art. No. L14314, 2004.
65. Billups, K., R.E.M. Rickaby, and D.P. Schrag. Cenozoic pelagic Sr/Ca records: Exploring a link to paleoproductivity. *Paleoceanography*, 19 (3), Art. No. PA3005, 2004.
66. Poussart, P.F., M.N. Evans, and D.P. Schrag. Resolving seasonality in tropical trees: multi-decade, high-resolution oxygen and carbon isotope records from Indonesia and Thailand. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 218 (3-4), 301-316, 2004.
67. Moore, T.S., R.W. Murray, A.C. Kurtz, and D.P. Schrag. Anaerobic methane oxidation and the formation of dolomite. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 229 (1-2), 141-154, 2004.
68. Poussart, P.F. and D.P. Schrag. Seasonally resolved stable isotope chronologies from northern Thailand deciduous trees. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 235 (3-4), 752-765, 2005.
69. Halverson, G.P., P.F. Hoffman, D.P. Schrag, A.C. Maloof, and A.H.N. Rice. Toward a Neoproterozoic composite carbon-isotope record. *GSA Bulletin*, 117 (9-10), 1181-1207, Sep-Oct 2005.

70. Li, C., D.S. Battisti, D.P. Schrag, and E. Tziperman. Abrupt climate shifts in Greenland due to displacements of the sea ice edge. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32 (19), Art. No. L19702, 2005.
71. Turchyn, A.V. and D.P. Schrag. Cenozoic Evolution of the Sulfur Cycle; Insight from Oxygen Isotopes in Marine Sulfate. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 241, 769-779, 2006.
72. Biddle, J.F., J.S. Lipp, M.A. Lever, K.G. Lloyd, K.B. Sorensen, R. Anderson, H.F. Fredricks, M. Elvert, T.J. Kelly, D.P. Schrag, M.L. Sogin, J.E. Brenchley, A. Teske, C.H. House, and K-U Hinricks. Heterotrophic Archaea dominate sedimentary subsurface ecosystems off Peru. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 103 (10), 3846-3851, March 7, 2006.
73. Ghosh, P., J. Adkins, H. Affeck, B. Balta, W. Guo, E.A. Schauble, D. Schrag, and J.M. Eiler.  $^{13}\text{C}$ - $^{18}\text{O}$  bonds in carbonate minerals: A new kind of Paleothermometer. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 70 (6), 1439-1456, March 15, 2006.