

B. Arrindell statement to Chartered EPA SAB Board
for Damascus Citizens for Sustainability

dcs@damascusCitizens.org office phone 845-252-6677

We strongly support the SAB panel's recommendations to remove the unsubstantiated 'no widespread...' statement as not related to data and totally undefined. The necessity to clearly link statements to evidence provided in the body of the final Assessment Report is indicative of the difference between a scientific analysis of data and a propaganda statement.

Also yes, we strongly support the SAB recommendation to include and critically analyze the status, data on potential releases, and any available findings from the EPA and state investigations conducted in Dimock, Pennsylvania; Pavillion, Wyoming; and Parker County, Texas - this should include the Garfield County impact study, all suppressed data from Dimock and all data from Parker County including tests done by residents.

These might be considered 'local' impacts, but along with many other areas suffering from the results of fracking and associated processes, the idea that 'local' means dismiss, irrelevant, not important, is so wrong. Local multiplied makes regional, water flows to rivers and many contaminants are harmful at very low concentrations.

There is an explanation for the dismissal of 'local' and of damage to individuals and whole communities - a combination of environmental IN-justice and the fact of the exemptions pursued and held by the gas and oil industry. There are so many papers, many of them from the drilling industry, that detail the way that the drilling processes and hydraulic fracturing cause damage and how that damage cannot be corrected, it is obvious why they needed the exemptions, to isolate the companies from liability for damages they knew they would cause. I have an abbreviated list of documentation in my written comments. As for the companies' focus on drilling in poor, rural communities, here's just one of many examples: "Range Resources' vice president for legislative and regulatory affairs, told a Pennsylvania Bar Institute gathering in Harrisburg [in April], that the company tries to avoid siting its shale gas wells near "big houses" where residents might have the financial resources to challenge the industrial-type developments."

All available EPA, state AND reliable residents' data should be in the study to have a robust data pool. Please understand that there never will be prospective studies - the industry already knows the processes mess up where they work so do not expect them to participate in proving that damages result from these processes - they already know. That is why they worked for decades to get the exemptions. And that's why they buy out and force gag orders on effective communicators of damage - so that public knowledge of the damage is hidden, but the public health impact is not removed.

I am also submitting in my written comments the newly released Dimock ATSDR report, and the older Dimock leaked EPA powerpoint - both say there is ongoing damage. On thing I greatly disagree with in the SAB panel's report is the stress on how the perceived damages may be "temporary, though substantial..." - There is no data that the impacts are temporary, so how can the panel say the might be? We are supposed to be fact based in this study, yes? Actually there are measurements that show continuing impacts - for instance in the Terry Township-Wyalusing area where we have taken measurements of the gas migration event that started in 2010 and is still ongoing as shown by CRDS measurements in 2015. Reports with my written comments.

Once there is aquifer connections to formation layers and movement of gas, materials injected and from the layers, etc. there is permanent damage with places, people and communities suffering from continuing degradation of their once usable water ...now trashed. Please take these situations seriously, it's not about

company profits, or stock holders' opinions of the companies, this is about whether areas where drilling is occurring can support healthy life or are evacuation zones with heavy climate impacts.

Attached with these comments are the following:

TheSkyisPink documentation as why they needed the exemptions, so that is why there never will be prospective studies - the industry already knows the processes mess up where they work found here: <http://www.damascuscitizensforsustainability.org/2012/06/theskyispink/>

Range Resources Bossert statement of RR's environmental IN-justice siting procedures http://powersource.post-gazette.com/powersource/latest-oil-and-gas/2016/04/18/Executive-s-remark-about-shale-gas-well-sites-prompts-sharp-criticism-calls-for-review/stories/201604180027?utm_campaign=echobox&utm_medium=social&utm_source=Twitter#link_time=1461017155

the exemptions as removing liability - Earthworks, loopholes paper a short clear summary: https://www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/FS_LoopholesForPollutersNEW.pdf

Dimock ATSDR report <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/news/displaynews.asp?PRid=2617>

Dimock leaked EPA powerpoint - attached

list of the harmed <https://pennsylvaniaallianceforcleanwaterandair.wordpress.com/the-list/>

The following will be in additional emails and above linked material will be sent as pdfs

aquifer connections to formation layers and gas/oil movement -

non-disclosures removing data

Wyalusing where we have taken measurements of the gas migration event that started in 2010 and is still ongoing as shown by CRDS measurements in 2015 (attach all...)