

DRBC Telephonic Public Hearing: March 6, 2018

Steve Tambini: Okay, good afternoon. This is Steve Tambini again. I am the executive director of DRBC and I am the hearing officer for today's public hearing. We just had a recess for about 20 minutes. We are going to start the public hearing again. It looks like there is at least one person who would like to speak. So, I am going to turn it back over to the operator and she will call out the names and ask anyone else if they would like to join.

Operator: And as a reminder, if you would like to make a statement today, please press the star and one on your touchtone keypad. We will go to Tom Yarnick. Please spell your last name for the record. You have three minutes.

Tom Yarnick: Thank you. The last name is spelled Y-A-R-N-I-C-K. I retired from the oil and gas industry in 2017 after nearly 39 years serving in various regulatory and environmental positions within the industry and now I do remain engaged now as an environmental consultant. So, from that perspective and background, it is simply clear to me that hydraulic fracturing can and is being done safely from both an environmental and public health perspective throughout the region and across the country. I see no scientifically or technically supported basis for the proposed hydraulic fracturing prohibition within the Delaware River Basin.

However, I am not opposed to reasonable and protective regulations related to hydraulic fracturing such as are already in place throughout the rest of Pennsylvania. I would therefore encourage DRBC to replace the proposed ban _____ [00:43:58] with either a set of responsible regulations or reliant on host state regulations where those exist. Thank you.

Operator: Thank you. We will go next to Gokan Seker. Please spell your last name.

Gokan Seker: S-E-K-E-R.

Operator: You have three minutes.

Gokan Seker: Okay, thank you. As a concerned citizen I urge DRBC, the complete ban on fracking for the health reasons and for the complete science is out for the health reasons for the environmental reasons. So, I am urging them to basically ban the fracking until we have complete scientific outcomes out in public. Thank you very much. Have a great day.

Operator: Thank you. We will go next to Tracy Carluccio. Please spell your last name for the record. You have three minutes.

Tracy Carluccio: Carluccio, C-A-R-L-U-C-C-I-O. I wanted to set the record straight on some claims that were being made about a study that was done by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission about the impacts of fracking in the Susquehanna River watershed. There was analysis done of that report by the U.S. Geologic Survey. They came up with some very interesting conclusions looking at the report and what the SRBC had actually examined.

First of all, it's important to understand that the SRBC was mainly looking at quantity of water and whether or not they felt they had enough water in order to support the fracking that was going on throughout the Susquehanna River Basin. They did not do an expansive or even a very limited water quality analysis. USGS concluded that the existing surface water data in the Susquehanna data set that they used are not sufficient to detect whether the cumulative effects of shale gas development are resulting in water quality changes. The magnitude of the water quality change that could occur from contamination related to shale gas development is not known, but it would take at least three to six years in the basin to monthly monitor it to detect a 20 percent change in median specific conductants or total barium in the basin, which is what the USGS recommends be done in order to assess long term changes that occurring in the watershed as a result of fracking.

Only four of the 22 surface water monitoring sites in the basin done, looked at the SRBC with enough existing data for a water quality trend analysis for barium or specific conductants are located in the watersheds where fracking is occurring. So, they looked at areas where no fracking was going on and then used that data in order when they did their calculations. Very few of the 26-recommended surface water monitoring parameters that are available for those sites actually testing for what is in the frack wastewater or the frack fluids were used. So, they really did not look at things such as gross alpha, gross beta, radium 226, radium 228, uranium, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, xylene, or methane. These are very important contaminants related to fracking.

There is no systematic large scale, long term monitoring effort underway to assess the effects of shale gas development on ground water quality in the basin either. That was pointed out by the USGS and seen as an important missing element in what the Susquehanna River Basin should be doing if they want to do an analysis on the impacts of fracking.

The groundwater sampling sites with existing data that they had are rarely located within one mile of our fracking well. It was made very clear in the report from the USGS that in order for any analysis to be done that looks at the impacts of fracking--

Operator: It's been three minutes. Please conclude your comments.

Tracy Carluccio: I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. We think that it's very important that the true elements of the SRB said is considered, not what people want it to have said. Thank you very much.

Operator: Thank you. We will go next to Faith Zerbe. Please spell your last name for the record. You have three minutes.