Thomas led a paper titled: *Eco-environmental effects of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau uplift during the Quaternary in China.* The paper overviewed the effects of the aforementioned geologic event on the regional paleoclimate. Several questions about the actual processes involved were talked about; how the uplift would change the trade winds, would the effects be global as well as regional, etc. The cyclical nature of uplift, isostacy and erosion were touched on as well. Nathan expressed several concerns with the paper; while it was clearly a review paper the references obviously did not have a balanced literature review. It was interesting to think about the fact that there are so many international scientists studying the region and probably not reading each others papers? Or perhaps this paper was met to highlight the Chinese work to other authors? However, it seemed that the level of peer review was a bit weak as there were few figures, missing citations for rates and other quantifications and some language issues. Those who commented overall did not think the paper went far enough in detail of review and relegated it to an historical piece rather than a scientific study.

Brad led discussion of: *Electrochemical Acceleration of Chemical Weathering as an Energetically Feasible Approach to Mitigating Anthropogenic Climate Change.* The thrust of the article was to present a solution to reducing carbon emissions into the atmosphere via carbon sequestration in the Earth’s oceans. The general sentiment was one of dissatisfaction with the proposed method, citing (among other things) our lack of understanding of the climate and aquatic ecosystems, the idea may create more problems than we began with, and the irresponsibility of introducing dangerous chemicals into the ecosystem on a large scale. Those who commented agreed that the chemistry was very interesting and it was an intriguing idea, but a balanced view of the global implications and tradeoffs were not well-considered (especially considering the huge claim laid in the title). Either the article should have gone further to research the ecological tradeoffs of applying this idea to the ocean system or they should have focused more on the chemical feasibility of the idea and placed more of a caveat in the writing that much more research will need to be done to see if it is a desirable or even feasible idea..

Alexis led discussion of the article: *Supervolcanoes and their Explosive Supereruptions.* This article was a little less technical than the prior two and summarized the mechanics of the supervolcano. Topics discussed were the geologic processes involved, focusing mostly on Yellowstone. Societal impacts were heavily discussed and most of those who commented found the idea of mitigation impractical, if not impossible, due to the catastrophic nature of the event. We hypothesized that regionally the effects would be enormous and completely wipe out or shift social and ecological systems. Globally the impact would be devastating, but not final. Nevertheless, everyone agreed that the science was indeed fascinating.