

GENE A. WILSON

101 Madison Street, P.O. Box 702, Louisa, KY 41230
(606) 638-9601 • Fax (606) 638-1041

Date: 2-9-09

TO:

Name: Eurika Durr

Company: _____

Facsimile Phone: 202-233-0121

FROM:

Name: Gene Wilson

MESSAGE:

Number Of Pages To Follow: 6

If not received in its entirety, or if this document is not legible, please call the number above. The information contained in this facsimile message and in any accompanying documents constitutes confidential information which belongs to the recipient and or sender. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this information you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is strictly prohibited by law. If you have received this facsimile message in error, please immediately notify the sender or recipient by telephone (collect) at 606-638-9601 to arrange for its return. Thank You!

GENE A. WILSON

101 Madison Street, P.O. Box 702, Louisa, KY 41230
(606) 638-9601 • Fax (606) 638-1041

February 9, 2009


U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Clerk of the Board
Environmental Appeals Board
1341 G Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005

Re: Gene A. Wilson
Docket No. SDWA 04-2005-1016
SDWA Appeal No. 08-09

Dear Sir/Madam:

Please file my Reply To Response Brief Of Complainant, which is self-explanatory.

Sincerely,


Gene A. Wilson

GAW:pmc

Enclosures

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

In re:

Gene A. Wilson

Docket No. SDWA 04-2005-1016

SDWA Appeal No. 08-09

REPLY TO RESPONSE BRIEF OF COMPLAINANT

Comes the Respondent, Gene A. Wilson, Replying To Complainant's Response
Brief and states as follows:

Over two (2) years passed before Respondent received a reply to his Freedom Of
Information Act (FOIA) Appeal, which came in the mail enclosed with the Response
Brief of Complainant.

Complainant (EPA) wishes to characterize Respondent as a person in the oil and
gas business and wants to set an example for others that EPA enforces its regulations.
Respondent was never considered a member of the oil and gas community but a farmer in
the Martha Oil Field. See Complainant's Exhibit "1" Page 8.

After cleaning up the brine water on Cam Creek in 1992-1993 Respondent had no
employees related in any way with production in the oil and gas industry (well in question
is on Respondent's farm of Collier Creek). The forms released with other documents
through the FOIA Appeal titled Administration Action Data Sheet identified a small
business as employing 100 or fewer employees. Respondent employed no one after

cleaning up Cam Creek. Respondent doesn't even come up to EPA's minimal standard in the business. Who is Respondent being made an example for! Other farmers? This is why Kentucky Oil and Gas Inspectors freely came to Respondent's defense and testified at the hearing.

EPA advised in 1989 that the UIC permit for Collier Creek would not be issued unless additional information was furnished. See Complainant's Exhibit "3".

Respondent did not know how many injection wells were needed to clean up Cam Creek some four (4) miles away and considered the Collier Creek well as back up if needed.

The permit was issued without furnishing additional information requested in Complainant's Exhibit "3". Through the FOIA Respondent noted other wells never put in service (as Respondent's) the permits were cancelled.

At page 8 of Complainant's Response Brief Complainant states by filing Form 7520-10 Respondent could inject fluids. Respondent had no fluids to inject. He was still attempting to correct his permit to take oil producers brine water but to no avail. Had the permit been modified, the well would have been completed to take brine water and Respondent would have created a little business on his farm disposing of operators brine water. This unfortunately never materialized.

At page 12 of the Response Brief EPA is still arguing Respondent's UIC permit was an inactive well. By definition an inactive well was one that had been placed in operation by injecting brine water requiring plugging if no injecting occurred for two (2) years. By definition a shut in well is one never placed in operation. Respondent's well was considered a shut in on all EPA forms making a destination requiring no plugging unless directed to do so by EPA. During the 2004 inspection by Mr. Randy Vaughn on

Respondent's farm the classification was wrongfully changed to a inactive well. All EPA forms make a clear distinction with the two (2) types wells. See EPA forms that are Complainant's Exhibits "12", "18" and "29".

At page 14 of the Brief Complainant makes an erroneous statement that salt water could come up from lower levels to reach USDW's. The pipe and earth was filled solid with cement below 939 feet to prevent such an occurrence. Respondent would never be stupid enough to destroy the fresh water on his farm.

At page 18 and 19 of Complainant's Brief EPA again argues that after a cessation for two (2) years the well is classified as an inactive well (no argument from Respondent since not classified as a shut-in) requiring plugging. EPA states "the use of the "cessation" terminology can *probably* (emphasis added) be attributed to the *assumption* (emphasis added) that most entities that obtain permits for underground injection do actually inject fluids into the wells". This is not true in Respondents case and that is why it was classified as shut-in and not an inactive well.


At page 21 EPA makes reference to Complainant's Exhibit "29". This Appendix "A" to all UIC permits changed the requirement of a shut-in well owner to file form 7520-11 even if the annual report is marked "0" for injecting. This document was never received by Respondent. Through the FOIA Appeal it also reflects the document was not mailed to Respondent. See last page furnished to Respondent through FOIA Appeal. Also Respondent's Exhibits "14", "2" and "3" are not shown to have been in the file. Also issues relating to Complainant's Exhibit "14" when Respondent was on site for an MIT in 1999 and EPA's inspector, Mr. David Hayes failed to show to observe the test and EPA terminated his employment. This MIT was to be rescheduled by EPA but its

data base apparently did not reflect this error.

It is now clear to Respondent he was not maintained on EPA's data base or he would have received Appendix "A" to his UIC permit in 2000 and the data base would have adequately shown no MIT was conducted for a substantial period of time to prevent a non compliance issue.

Finally, at no time did Respondent ignore any notices, communications or directives from EPA as erroneously claimed at page 27 of EPA's Brief.

Respectfully Submitted



Gene A. Wilson
P.O. Box 702
Louisa, KY 41230
(606) 638-9601
(606) 638-1041 fax


CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

The undersigned does hereby certify that the Original of this Reply To Response Brief of Complainant was faxed and mailed for filing, Express Mail, to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board, 1341 G Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005; and that a copy was served by U.S. First Class Mail on (1) Ms. Patricia A. Bullock, Regional Hearing Clerk, U.S. EPA, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30303-8960; (2) USEPA Presiding Officer Susan B. Schub, Regional Judicial Officer, U.S. EPA, Region 4, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30303-8960; (3) Counsel Ms. Zylpha

Pryor, Associate Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W.,
Atlanta, GA 30303-8960; (4) Counsel Mr. Paul Schwartz, Associate Regional Counsel,
U.S. EPA, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30303-8960; and (5) Mr.
Nicholas N. Owens, National Ombudsman, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd
Street, SW, MC 2120, Washington, DC 20416-0005, on this 9th, day of February, 2009.

Feb 09 09 02:20p

Dated: February 9, 2009


Gene A. Wilson
P.O. Box 702
Louisa, KY 41230
(606) 638-9601
(606-638-1041 fax)