

From: John Kerekes

Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 5:32 PM

To: Hanlon, Edward <Hanlon.Edward@epa.gov>

Subject: HF SAB comments

Attached are the comments I intend to provide on Feb 1 if allowed to participate in the review call.. Thanks very much.

John P. Kerekes

Kerekes Consulting LLC

Morrison, CO 80465

January 22, 2016

Subject: Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OA-2015-0245

To the Members of US EPS's Science Advisory Board, HF Research Advisory Panel:

I am writing today to voice my support for the draft report "Assessment of Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing for Oil and Gas on Drinking Water Resources". It is my understanding that this report represents the findings of a five-year effort, includes approximately 950 sources of credible scientific findings and analysis, and is based on peer-reviewed scientific studies, papers and technical reports.

Surely this exhaustive effort meets any reasonable criteria for "scientific and technical adequacy" and should now be finalized and adopted. I also want to note that I fully support the Report's conclusion that the states are effectively regulating hydraulic fracturing and that HF has not led to widespread, systemic impacts on drinking water.

There is a fear that this issue will become the subject of much fanatical demagoguery by the traditional opponents of HF activities "any time and any place". Safe, responsible hydraulic fracturing is the engine of America's energy revolution, says the American Petroleum Institute, and has been used commercially for 65 years. According to API, "at least 2 million oil and natural gas wells have been hydraulically fractured in this country, including up to 95% of new wells that account for more than 43% of US oil production and 67% of natural gas production".
(1)

The SAB must not let this important report become a political litmus test, like so many of the federal government's important energy policies have become. Just recently, the Administration

chose to disregard seven years of review by the US State Department and eight other federal agencies studying a myriad of environmental and economic issues and rejected a vital pipeline project for symbolic and international prestige reasons, not science or fact.

Thank you for your consideration of my views. I appreciate your efforts to support science-based energy policies and I look forward to a positive outcome in this very important matter.

Sincerely

John P. Kerekes, on behalf of Energy Nation

(1) Fracking Safety and Science Blog, Mark Green, Energytomorrow.org, 1/20/16.