with one of these alternatives always being no project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Since our DEP and EPA has found that fracking operations have contaminated numerous wells, how can we ever consider any circumstance where watershed resources can be used to make fracking possible? Please ban all fracking.

HEARING OFFICER:

Thank you, ma'am. Beth Kelley, and then Mark Lichty and then Harriet Shugarman. Okay. Is this Ms. Kelley?

MS. KELLEY:

Yes. Before I start I just have to ask a question. Will the clock start when I introduce myself or ---?

HEARING OFFICER:

The clock will start as soon as you say your name and you need to start by saying your name.

MS. KELLEY:

I'm not going to

50 1 introduce myself or state what my ---HEARING OFFICER: 2 Okay. We'll start right 3 4 Go. now. 5 MS. KELLEY: Okay. Hi. My name is 6 7 Beth Kelley and I live in New York 8 City. I have been following the 9 fracking industry for about eight 10 years. Ever since the de facto 11 moratorium went into place, every time 12 I read about fracking related incidents 1.3 such as gas explosions, chemical 14 spills, contaminated water, destroyed 15 ecosystems and so and so forth I assume 16 that the Commission is seeing the same 17 things and that, of course, it knows 18 that only a permanent ban will protect

When the DRB Governors made a big announcement last year that they were going to ban permanently fracking, I thought, yes, finally.

Then the draft regulations were

the Delaware River from the gas

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

industry.

released and it became obvious that celebrating was premature. As the Sierra Club's Jeff Tittel said so aptly, these proposed regulations are a dirty water deal hidden behind the fracking ban. So here we are.

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.4

Seventeen (17) million

people rely upon the Delaware River

basin for safe drinking water. Over

eight million of them live in New York

City, but DRBC must not want to hear

what many of these 17 million people

think about these regulations since

there are no hearings in New York City,

no hearings in New Jersey, no hearings

in Delaware.

A lot of people have to travel hours to get to the hearing.

This says a lot about the so-called public input process of the DRBC.

So my friends and I are here to lend our voices to eight million New York City residents who are incredibly fortunate to have such great tasting, safe drinking water from the

upper Delaware Catskill watersheds.

The water is so clean, so protected that the city doesn't have to filter it.

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

it, it would cost billions of dollars and this would be on top of the billions that the city already needs to maintain its aging infrastructure such as the current \$1 billion repair of the Delaware aqueduct tunnel.

It is unconscionable that the fracking industry doesn't have to disclose all the chemicals it uses.

Nobody knows exactly what is in fracking fluid and in fracking waste.

How can DRBC regulate what it doesn't know?

We don't know the effects of water withdrawals and so many fracking activities because the industry doesn't have to provide the data that scientists need.

The unprecedented exemptions given to this industry have

proven very convenient to them. And by the way, anyone that thinks that this industry could be discouraged is certainly misguided.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Because of all the known and unknown risks that fracking presents, DRBC must evoke the precautionary principle and ask how much harm is avoidable, instead of how much harm is acceptable? In order to carry on its mandate to protect the quality and quantity of the water, DRBC must prohibit fracking and all fracking related activities.

HEARING OFFICER:

I'm going to have to stop you at this point.

MS. KELLEY:

This informed decision will affect generations to come.

HEARING OFFICER:

Ma'am, you have to stop.

MS. KELLEY:

Do not fail them.

HEARING OFFICER:

54

1

Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

MS. KELLEY:

I read it a little slower than I practiced. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER:

Okay. Next, will be Mark Lichty, and then Harriet Shugarman and then Bill Shaughnessy.

MR. LICHTY:

Hi. My name is Mark
Lichty and I'm here as business person
and as a manufacturer. I want to make
the comment about the API testimony.
We know from five years ago that the
gas companies told us that there was no
leakage from wells. We know that they
claimed five years ago that it was
safe. We know the DEP five years ago
said that there was no leakage from
wells from fracking.

Well, indeed, today we know differently, that there has been leakage from wells. There's leakage from fracking in wells, and so I question the credibility of those