

oak Tree Properties

I think it is important for me to identify myself. I am a manufacturer who ten years ago was profracking and then became anti fracking. I spent \$200,000 converting a plant I owned from gas to oil. I believed that gas was less polluting. When I did the research I learned that the process of fracking was highly polluting, and changed my position. I felt so strongly about the moral aspect of this that I spent thousands of hours, and thousands of dollars making a film , Groundswell Rising, to let people know of its dangers. The sad part of this tale is that I do not now have that \$200,000 spent on the conversion to spend on clean energy.

Over a thousand studies establish the health consequences of fracking. We heard at the LCCC hearing API testify that it was safe. We heard five years ago that there was no water contamination from fracking. Even the DEP stated that. We knew differently at the time, and it subsequently came out that wells do indeed leak and contaminate water. The gas industry has lost any vestiges of credibility they once may have had. Since that time, the Pa Auditor General has stated that the "DEP is doing a woefully inadequate job of regulating the gas industry. " The gas industry has a disproportionate influence in the state (See the report Deep Drilling Deep Pockets).

I further observed that only one landowner testified at the hearing. He has an economic interest in the outcome. That contaminates his testimony. In fact, before I sold my plant I had an economic interest in gas, a cheaper fuel. Should I jeopardize my grandchildren by allowing that economic interest to prevail. I think not. The hundreds of people who have showed up to defend the Delaware have nothing to gain, but to protect a river.

I write here as well representing UUPLAN and a coalition of Faith groups that felt strongly that fracking and any related activity fracking is a moral issue. When there are a thousand studies establishing the risks of fracking, and they are ignored, this is a moral issue.

The preponderance of the evidence establishes that fracking is harmful. If this were a civil suit, the burden of proof would have shifted . The gas companies would have to rebut the evidence and establish why this is safe. They will be unable to do that.