



SIERRA CLUB

LONE STAR CHAPTER

To: Gwen Ricco
MC 205, Office of Legal Services
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

From: Evgenia Spears, Water Program Coordinator, Sierra Club Lone Star Chapter,
evgenia.spears@sierraclub.org, 979-739-1097
Cyrus Reed, Legislative and Conservation Director, Sierra Club Lone Star Chapter,
cyrus.reed@sierraclub.org, 512-740-4086

June 16, 2026

Re: **Public Comments Regarding Rule Project Number 2026-006-309-OW**

Sierra Club Lone Star Chapter, representing more than 21,000 members across Texas, submits the following comments to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) in response to the public comment period regarding Rule Project Number 2026-006-309-OW. We appreciate the opportunity to provide our input.

As the state chapter of the nation's oldest and largest conservation organization, we have long been engaged in water policy issues affecting Texas communities and the environment. Our comments below reflect significant concern regarding the proposed rules for implementing SB 1145, which could have far-reaching implications for how land application of treated produced water is permitted and regulated in Texas in the future.

In addition, we're submitting more than 170 comments from concerned Texans across the state. These attached public comments provide insight into the concerns, questions, and perspectives that Texans have about the proposed rules, and we strongly encourage TCEQ to review and carefully consider this public feedback.

The Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club is also a member of the Texas Living Waters coalition and supports the coalition's comments submitted separately. Our comments below reinforce several of the broader concerns while also providing additional perspectives that reflect the water priorities the Lone Star Chapter has been actively working on across the state.

General Concerns: The Proposed Rule Doesn't Fulfill the Intent of SB 1145

Texas generates approximately 25 million barrels of produced water each day. As a member of the Texas Produced Water Consortium (TxPWC), we have closely followed ongoing research into produced water treatment and reuse and have contributed to development of a water quality report recently released by the Consortium.¹ We support continued research and development of appropriate uses of produced water where supported by science. However, while certain beneficial uses may ultimately prove feasible, major questions remain regarding treatment standards, long-term environmental impacts, monitoring requirements, and protection of public health.

During the 89th Legislative Session, Sierra Club cautiously supported the intent of SB 1145. Specifically, we supported transferring permitting authority from the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) to the TCEQ. The reason for that transfer made sense: TCEQ is the agency responsible for protecting the state's water resources and public health and is better positioned to regulate management and disposal of produced water outside of the oil and gas field. We were also encouraged to see the final version of SB 1145 direct TCEQ to adopt standards for land application that prevent pollution of surface and subsurface water.

We expected TCEQ to use its expertise to develop a comprehensive regulatory program specifically focused on land application of treated produced water. However, rather than developing such a program, TCEQ proposes to incorporate produced water into an existing land application program developed for other wastewater streams, treating this highly toxic and complex effluent as typical industrial wastewater. Moreover, research on produced water reuse is still ongoing, treatment technologies aren't available, and many questions remain regarding constituents of concern, treatment standards, and long-term impacts on the environment and public health.

¹ *Produced Water Treatment Pilot Testing: Water Quality Report*. Texas Produced Water Consortium, 2026. Available at: <https://www.depts.ttu.edu/research/tx-water-consortium/downloads/TxPWCPilotTestingWaterQualityReportFINALweb.pdf>

The concerns outlined below are particularly significant in light of the HB 49 passage, which expanded liability protections associated with the treatment and beneficial use of produced water.² Under expanded liability protections, clear discharge standards, monitoring requirements, reporting obligations, public notice provisions, and enforcement mechanisms become the first line of defense against contamination of groundwater resources, surface waters, and impacts to wildlife, landowners, and nearby communities. Throughout the legislative process last session, we emphasized that any program authorizing land application of treated produced water would require these components. However, they're largely missing from the proposed rule. Without real enforceable standards, nearby landowners and other users of groundwater or surface water could face real damage with no real recourse.

Under the former RRC process, which authorized several permits for pilot studies in recent years, applicants seeking authorization to reuse produced water for land application were required to provide detailed information regarding wastewater quality, treatment methods, presence of toxic chemicals, groundwater conditions, monitoring, and public notice.³ The proposed rule doesn't explain how comparable protections will be incorporated into future permits or how TCEQ will ensure that land application of treated produced water is safe for the environment and Texas communities.

We strongly believe TCEQ should develop a separate regulatory framework specifically designed for produced water rather than forcing it into an existing program that was developed for different types of wastewater streams. We further outline our specific concerns in more detail below.

I. Despite being explicitly directed by the Legislature to develop discharge standards for produced water, in this proposal TCEQ doesn't do so. SB 1145 specifically directed TCEQ to "adopt standards for the land application" of treated produced water, including "standards that prevent pollution of surface and subsurface water".⁴ This expectation was also reflected in the bill author's statement of intent.⁵ However, instead of developing such protective standards, TCEQ is proposing to incorporate produced water into the existing land application program, which was originally developed for other wastewater streams. Furthermore, the rule doesn't establish discharge standards specifically

² [HB 49, 89th Leg., R.S. \(2025\)](#)

³ *Application Information for a Permit to Land Apply Produced Water or Gas Plant Effluent*. Railroad Commission of Texas:

<https://www.rrc.texas.gov/oil-and-gas/applications-and-permits/environmental-permit-types/landfarming-land-treatment-and-land-application-facilities/land-apply-produced-water-or-gas-plant-effluent/>

⁴ [SB 1145 Enrolled Version, 89th Leg., R.S. \(2025\)](#)

⁵ [SB 1145 Bill Analysis, 89th Leg., R.S. \(2025\)](#)

designed for treated produced water. We're deeply concerned with this course of action for the following reasons:

1. *Produced water is very different from many wastewater streams regulated under Chapter 309.* It contains high levels of salts, heavy metals, organic and inorganic compounds, PFAS, naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs), and other constituents associated with oil and gas production. In addition, some chemicals used in oil and gas operations in Texas are protected as trade secrets, which limits the information available to regulators, scientists that study produced water, and the public and makes it difficult to determine whether all constituents of concern have been identified and removed before land application occurs. These unique characteristics require stringent standards specifically designed for produced water rather than simple reliance on a regulatory framework that was never designed for this type of wastewater.
2. *Different land application uses may warrant different discharge standards.* As TCEQ develops specific standards for reuse of produced water for land application as required by SB 1145, the agency should consider how treated produced water will ultimately be used. In fact, the TxPWC's research recognizes that different types of reuse of treated produced water may require different treatment approaches and water quality targets.⁶ For example, land application on disturbed or damaged land poses different risks than applying it to crops that could be consumed by livestock or people, or to areas that support native habitats and wildlife. The proposed rule doesn't appear to reflect these distinctions and instead treats all land application scenarios as though they present the same level of risk to groundwater resources, drinking water wells, agricultural lands, sensitive habitats, and public health.
3. *The rule's reliance on case-by-case permit evaluations and professional judgment raises transparency and consistency concerns.* Consistent standards established through this rulemaking process would allow Texans to review, understand, and comment on the requirements that will regulate future land application projects. By contrast, a case-by-case approach leaves many critical details to be addressed during individual permit reviews "on the basis of best professional judgement." Texans shouldn't have to wait until permit applications are filed to learn what standards will apply to projects that could affect their water supplies, livelihoods,

⁶ *Beneficial Use of Produced Water in Texas.* Texas Produced Water Consortium Report to Texas Legislature, 2024. Available at: <https://www.depts.ttu.edu/research/tx-water-consortium/TXPWCFINALDRAFT.pdf>

and local wildlife. Those standards should be established through this rulemaking and made available for public review and comment before any permits for land application are considered by TCEQ.

II. TCEQ should define key terms, including “treated produced water” and “land application.” The rule repeatedly refers to "produced water that is treated for beneficial use" and the "land application of produced water", yet it doesn't define these terms. The definitions of these terms are necessary as they would influence how permits will be reviewed, what monitoring will be required, and how TCEQ will ensure compliance. A term like “treated” is open to interpretation. Does it mean that the salt has simply been removed, or does it include heavy metals or toxics? As written, the meaning of these terms is ambiguous, and the regulatory boundaries for land application of treated produced water remain unclear.

III. The proposed setback requirements are concerning. The rule would allow treated produced water to be applied as close as 100 feet from waters of the state and 150 feet from private water wells, but there's no clear explanation regarding how these distances were determined or why they were deemed sufficient to protect nearby water resources and drinking water supplies specifically from the risks associated with land application of treated produced water. TCEQ should provide the technical basis for the proposed distances and demonstrate why they're protective of environmental and public health harm. Otherwise, the TCEQ should consider much larger setback requirements.

IV. The proposed monitoring requirements don't address the unique risks associated with the reuse of produced water. The proposed rule requires groundwater assessments, identification of nearby wells, and baseline groundwater monitoring for total dissolved solids, nitrate nitrogen, chlorides, sulfates, pH, and *E. coli*. However, the rule doesn't establish monitoring requirements for many constituents commonly found in produced water, such as NORMs, PFAS, hydrocarbons, heavy metals, organic and inorganic compounds, and other potential contaminants of concern.⁷

Additionally, repeated land application raises a separate issue that isn't addressed in the draft rule: accumulation. Even when individual applications meet permit requirements, contaminants can build up over time after multiple applications to the same area. The proposed rule doesn't explain how TCEQ will monitor for the accumulation of these

⁷ *Produced Water Treatment Pilot Testing: Water Quality Report*. Texas Produced Water Consortium, 2026. Available at: <https://www.depts.ttu.edu/research/tx-water-consortium/downloads/TxPWCPilotTestingWaterQualityReportFINALweb.pdf>

contaminants or determine when concentrations may pose a risk to the environment and public health.

TCEQ should set specific monitoring requirements for the contaminants that make produced water different from other wastewater streams.

V. The draft rulemaking doesn't require to provide a public notice for land application projects, public input, or the opportunity to formally oppose the projects. The proposed rule doesn't include any public notice provisions specific to land application of treated produced water. It doesn't require notice to nearby landowners, groundwater conservation districts, river authorities, or other entities that may have an interest in local water resources. Due to the severity of potential impacts of land application of treated produced water on groundwater, surface water, wildlife, and landowners, affected entities and communities should receive a detailed and timely notice of proposed projects. We would like to reiterate that produced water presents unique risks that distinguish it from other wastewater streams. At a minimum, TCEQ should consider notice requirements for entities responsible for managing and protecting local water resources and for Texans who may be directly affected by future land application projects. There should also be an opportunity for public comment and response, and depending upon the size of the project, the opportunity for a contested case hearing.

VI. The rulemaking should include the compliance and enforcement provisions. The proposed rule doesn't clearly explain how compliance will be enforced. Combined with the lack of specific discharge standards and monitoring requirements, TCEQ seems to be creating a weak regulatory framework that would rely on addressing problems after permits have been issued rather than preventing such problems in the first place. It is difficult to see how this approach fulfills TCEQ's mission to protect public health and natural resources when the proposed rule doesn't clearly explain how the agency is going to ensure such protections.

IV. TCEQ should consider pausing this rulemaking and create an informal draft and stakeholder group. TCEQ should consider pausing the current rulemaking to allow land application of produced wastewater – as authorized by passage of SB 1145. Instead, allowing a more informal process for gathering input on a draft rulemaking would be helpful. The TCEQ could create a stakeholder group to help provide input to the regulatory framework. While this would mean the TCEQ would likely have to take a bit longer to get the rules in place, we believe it would still be possible to adopt rules by late 2026 if we were to start this process soon.

If we are going to continue, however, with the present rulemaking, we respectfully request that TCEQ extend the public comment period by at least 30 days. Additional time would allow the public to review the proposal, better understand its implications, and provide feedback on a matter that could affect their water resources, communities, and livelihoods. We also encourage TCEQ to consider holding additional public hearings in regions most likely to be affected by future land application projects, including South Texas and West Texas

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Comments from the Sierra Club Members

Through Sierra Club's public outreach efforts, Texans from across the state were encouraged to participate in this rulemaking. The concerns outlined below reflect the issues that Texas residents chose to support and submit to TCEQ. The list of Texans who supported these concerns and any personal comments to TCEQ are included separately.

Concerns submitted by Texans:

The proposed rules address a complex issue with potentially significant implications for Texas water resources and communities. The public needs more time to better understand the proposed rules to participate in the process in a more meaningful and informed way.

Adding produced water to an existing wastewater management program is concerning. Produced water isn't an ordinary industrial wastewater stream. It can contain contaminants that may not be present in other wastewater, including naturally occurring radioactive materials. The rule should include standards and monitoring requirements that specifically address the unique characteristics and risks associated with reuse of produced water.

Discharge standards specifically designed for treated produced water haven't been developed by TCEQ despite being explicitly directed by the Legislature. SB 1145 language specifically required TCEQ to "adopt standards for the land application..., including standards that prevent the pollution of surface and subsurface water," which was restated in the bill author's statement of intent. The proposed rule doesn't establish such standards and instead proposes addressing this issue on a case-by-case basis during the permitting process. As a result, it remains unclear how TCEQ will determine whether treated produced water is safe to apply on land and whether nearby groundwater, surface water, wildlife, and communities will be protected from harm.

Produced water should not be applied too close to water resources and drinking water supplies. The proposed rule would allow treated produced water to be applied as close as 100 feet from surface waters and 150 feet from private water wells. Given the unique contaminants that may be present in produced water, TCEQ should explain how these distances were determined and how they were deemed sufficient to protect nearby surface waters, groundwater resources, and private drinking wells.

Writing the regulations before robust research can inform them is unreasonable.

Research on produced water treatment and reuse is still underway, yet TCEQ is developing rules that could allow treated produced water to be applied on land. There's no sufficient scientific evidence that treatment and reuse of produced water is safe for the environment and public health. Until those gaps are addressed and safety can be demonstrated, TCEQ should not move forward with these rules.

The rulemaking should be based on a complete understanding of what may be present in produced water. Some chemicals used in the oil and gas industry operating in Texas are protected as trade secrets, which limits the information available to regulators, researchers, and the public. If we don't know everything that may be present in produced water, we can't be confident that the proposed regulations address all potential risks.

TCEQ should consider different standards depending on the purpose of the land application. Land application of treated produced water on disturbed or damaged land is fundamentally different from putting produced water on crops that could be consumed by livestock or people, or for native habitats.

Name	City	Zip	Personal Message to TCEQ
Gayle Borst	Austin	78721	As a cancer survivor, I know the importance of nontoxic water, soil and air. But EVERYONE wants a clean environment! Help make/keep Texas a safe place to live!
Harold Parkey	Fort Worth	76135	As a longtime Texas resident and Vietnam veteran I am very concerned with this issue.
Juli Kring	Houston	77099	As a mother and a grandmother, I am very concerned for the health and viability of the planet our children and future generations will inherit. We have a duty to our communities, families and most importantly, children to ensure their safety and well being through environmentally sound and sustainable policies, including clean air, water, addressing climate change, etc. That duty will always be more important than politics or profit.
David Todd	Austin	78704	As a rancher in an active oil and gas production area, with significant produced water, I urge the state to extend the public comment period to assure full participation, and to start now to develop discharge standards, with rules protecting all drinking water sources and bonding requirements for cleanup.

Sarah Larocca	Austin	78735	As a scientist and environmental advocate, I urge TCEQ to reconsider these proposed rules on produced water land application. Produced water is not ordinary wastewater. It can contain radioactive materials and undisclosed chemical additives requiring specialized standards, not a case-by-case permitting approach. The proposed buffer distances of 100 feet from surface water and 150 feet from private wells lack scientific justification and are insufficient to protect our drinking water and ecosystems. Research on produced water reuse is still underway. Promulgating rules before safety can be demonstrated is premature and irresponsible. Trade secret protections for oil and gas chemicals create dangerous blind spots in the regulatory framework. Finally, standards must distinguish between application contexts. Disturbed land versus cropland or native habitat. Texas water is precious and irreplaceable. I urge TCEQ to slow down, follow the science, and protect our communities.
Cynthia Dominguez	Rusk	75785	Clean safe water is vital to all things.
Lisa & Jason Spangler	Livingston	77399	Clean water is precious and necessary for life - don't pollute it with industrial waste water.
Kathy Jamail	Dickinson	77539	Double filter water before flushing. No drinking water.
John Mossbarger	Granbury	76048	Ensure the quality of our drinking water!
Sofia Ko	San Antonio	78212	For a matter of such big importance, TCEQ needs to set standards and requirements for the application of produced water on land that is actually backed by sound research that takes into account the unique composition of produced water effluent compared to domestic sewage effluent. The current distances/buffer zone of 100-150 feet between TLAPs and waterways is concerning and should be thoroughly justified with scientific evidence showing that this distance is sufficient to make sure produced water won't contaminate groundwater or surface waters. Additionally, how is TCEQ going to muster up the required personnel and funding to now also regulate TLAPs for industrial effluent when the proposed rulemaking doesn't consider the costs of this transfer of duties onto TCEQ?
Angela Newell	Katy	77450	Help save Texas's water, please.

Darren Huff	Round Rock	78681	I believe it is a moral outrage that we are moving forward in an intentionally slapdash and shoddy way so that we can poison our drinking water while pretending to plausibly shrug "aw shucks", "golly", and "whodathunkit", and deny wrongdoing in order to further empower the oil and gas industry, whose greed is boundless. Our climate's destruction is well underway, and we should be rushing towards clean energy alternatives. Instead, we're accelerating the poisoning of our water and land--in addition to our air. This pathology for profit over life will kill us all. Consider your children, and their children. Our current course is ruinous--for everyone.
Jill Koch	Georgetown	78633	I do not want oilfield wastewater watering our crops, running through our rivers, or in our children's water bottles. Please protect our children and our resources.
Tonya Kleuskens	Canyon	79015	I respectfully request that TCEQ extend the public comment period by at least 30 days and substantially revise the proposal before adoption. Regional Water Managers are only beginning to understand how to clean up Produced Water and to what extent it can be cleaned. Produced water is not ordinary wastewater. It can contain salts, metals, hydrocarbons, treatment chemicals, and naturally occurring radioactive materials that may threaten groundwater, surface water, soils, agriculture, livestock, wildlife, private wells, and public health.
Sk Meyer	Canyon Lake	78133	I stay informed about the activities, proposals and legislation involving our water resources and supply and use. Common Sense is sorely lacking in any "Study" or proposal that cannot or will not address consequences of irresponsible wastewater disposal. TCEQ and other entities controlling water use seem oblivious to the fact that they "foul their own nest" as well when recklessness and shortsightedness are allowed to prevail.
Rich Smith	Cedar Park	78613	I vote for leaders who care about the quality and care of our environment.
Christian Barajas	McAllen	78501	I'm concerned about the water quality. Please help protect wildlife and people.
Brandt Mannchen	Houston	77006	I'm concerned about produced water and the chemicals it contains. We need to move slowly and make sure the technology is in place to clean this water so those chemicals don't pollute our soil, water, food, vegetation, and wildlife. Any solution to cleaning up oil/gas produced water must come with how the residues filtered out will be disposed of safely so they won't pollute our environment.
Melany McClurg	Bandera	78003	It's absurd to consider that toxic wastewater can be cleaned up for public use in any form. Let the data centers use it, instead of sucking up our water.

Adrienne Inglis	Lago Vista	78645	Make Texas waterways safer
Jack Kirfman	Austin	78717	Make them clean up their own messes. Don't let them pollute our water resources
Susan A Franklin	Benbrook	76126	MUST ACT TO PRESERVE WATER QUALITY
Marni Kane	Austin	78704	My three young children and I live near the river. Please don't compromise their health and safety with toxic water! Keep our precious fresh waters clean!
J Baker	Huntsville	77340	Please consider the long-term welfare of Texans' health and the beauty of our state over the privileges accorded to business.
Melanie Gibson	Dallas	75208	Please do everything you can to protect our Texas waterways.
Dara Zoboroski	Fischer	78623	Please take action to protect our environment allowing ALL living organisms to thrive & not migrate to destroy natural resources and habitat elsewhere.
Elizabeth Marie Watson Smith	Austin	78704	Please take time to ensure safety
steve doer	Houston	77082	Produced water needs to be processed for reuse and recovery of critical minerals instead of only pumping into the subsurface strata causing longer term pollution issues
Dan Jones	Linden	75563	Produced water should be used in a closed system for cooling of data centers with transport paid by producers of oil and data alike.
Gabriel Rodriguez	Kingwood	77345	Produced water should only be used in closed loop industrial applications. Cooling data centers seems to be a potential application. Even after treatment this water will not be clean enough for agricultural or any human consumption. Please protect our health and the health of future generations.
Susan Eda	Houston	77055	Reuse the oil wastewater by requiring data centers to purchase it and use it instead of fresh water
Leslie Gibson	Celeste	75423	Right now I support Sierra Club on these requests before finalizing the produced water. I know it must be addressed timely but please consider the below requests. I do read the notices in my local paper and I appreciate your needed role in our helping industry and minimizing ramifications to environment. Thank you!
Philip Scott	Houston	77084	Safe and clean water is fundamental to a safe and clean environment. In these days of extreme water shortage, we can not continue to release polluted contaminated water into our ecosystems. This affects ground water and surface water. People's lives are put at risk. Wildlife is put at risk. Farm and ranch animals are put at risk. Crops are put at risk. We have allowed this for far too long and we must correct this now.

Nadia luis	austin	78748	Soil health is the primary foundation for any healthy ecosystem. The utilization of waste water in already overburdened soils will likely result in negative consequences for our soils. Crop production is already affected by excessive nitrogen, zinc, and copper. Adding waste water to these stressed soil conditions could result in dangerous unforeseen results.
Linda Griffith	Salado	76571	TCEQ should definitely consider a different set of standards depending on the purpose of the land application.
Joyce Hamilton	Harlingen	78552	Texans deserve a thorough, professional and careful study of the implications of releasing this water onto land so close to our natural water resources. This could certainly be a public health issue, a serious one.
Caroline Gamble	College Station	77840	Texans deserve safe food, safe water, and clear communication from legislators. Our lives are more important than oil and gas companies' profits. Preserving our land and human health is the best way to ensure long-term profit and success for everyone. Without natural resources and a healthy workforce, our economy will collapse. We cannot keep exploiting living beings and landscapes. It's time to take care of our environment, and that starts with listening to Texans regarding this law. Put all Texans first, not the oil and gas companies.
Matt Helton	Woodway	76712	Texas is already facing a water crisis as uses outstrip demand. I fear adding produced water into the system risks fouling the already strained freshwater sources. We need to be extremely careful that we do not allow toxins in produced water to contaminate our crops, neighborhoods or current water sources.
Pat Reinecker	Bedford	76021	Texas is already in a water crisis state with population growth, added data centers being built everywhere and too much un-needed irrigation of St. Augustine lawns and yards. Billions of gallons of wastewater is another enormous burden to our water supply. Please consider what's good for Texans, Texas wildlife and our environment.
L M	Cypress	77433	THANK YOU.
Mark Goodman	Dallas	75248	Thanks for reading my letter and taking action.
Devin Ehlert	Cypress	77429	The area around the Permian basin drilling sites is quickly becoming uninhabitable due the wastewater pumped into the ground to cap the many expired wells that have saturated the earth with pressurized toxic waste that is now coming to the surface poisoning streams, cattle ponds and ground water. Time to make the oil companies clean up their mess and stop this reckless behavior.
Linda Garcia	Houston	77039	The future generations need to be protected.

Dan Harrison	Hutto	78634	The generators of treated produced water should be required to periodically sample and test the water before any land application occurs and during the application process. The results of this testing analysis should be submitted to the TCEQ. In addition, the TCEQ should develop a full list of the potentially harmful or risky contaminants and constituents which may be contained in produced water for the testing analyses.
Richard Jones	Clyde	79510	The issue of reclaiming and reusing both FRAC and drill water is extremely important for Texas. Our citizens need to be educated and informed on the extent of these proposals. There needs to be an extension for both public comment and public education. I propose that there be town hall meetings to lay out the facts and the plans going forward. I look forward to reading your written reply.
Natasha Tuckett	College Station	77845	There should be a better way to separate water from oil and other substrates.
Leigh Ziegler	Austin	78735	This and most TCEQ permit applications should not be developer self-monitored!
Michael Solis	League City	77573	This contaminated water must not be used or allowed near any area where Texans could be affected. The companies producing this waste water should pay for all disposal costs!
Paula Denmom	Red Oak	75154	This is ridiculously simple. Dirty oil well waste water must not be reused. Government is just GUESSING what might be safe. The science has not been completed. Do not put this in some community where you think no one will see! We are watching and are demanding 30 day extension for public comments and
Louis M. Williams lii	Austin	78757	This issue matters to me because I don't want oilfield wastewater watering our crops, running through our rivers, or filling our children's water bottles!
Rainbow Di Benedetto	Austin	78750	Wastewater must be handled carefully to protect us and the environment from detrimental effects!
Holly Sabiston	Austin	78751	Water is our most important resource, and Texas is in a decades-long drought. PLEASE listen, consider all evidence-based information before signing away our state's future.
Diane Castro	Keller	76248	Water is valuable and limited. Let's make sure we treat it and ourselves right. We will need it.
Gordon Albury	Hickory Creek	75065	Water quality is precious!
Ruth Reid	Corpus Christi	78414	Water=Health!; Dirty Water=Bad Health

Tracey Bonner	Arlington	76014	We ALL have a responsibility to work together in order to Protect and SAVE our Wilderness, Waterways and Environment from senseless Destruction and Poisoning in the name of Ignorance and Greed. Harm to Habitat IS Harm to all Fauna and Flora, as well as all Humankind!
David Hill	San Antonio	78261	We know almost nothing about the safety of this "produced" water - the only reason we're even considering dumping this into our drinking water, waterways, or fields is pure unvarnished greed. We need to slow down and study this water, force oil and gas companies to disclose what is in it (and their fracking fluid), and make sure it can even be made safe before we just start using it so we can build more data centers.
Ken Savage	Bacliff	77518	We must accept responsibility to return the water to its original consumable form. Remove all contaminants as a result of oilfield production. Our earth is our home and not accepting responsibility to protect our home is accepting a death warrant that we can prevent. Responsibility is ours. So do we kill our world or accept our responsibility to protect it. I say protect our world. There are other energy resources than oil. We just don't want to work hard to protect our home it appears. Pollute and hide is very sad. Just look at your family and convince yourself it is ok to kill them with our neglect. No way...clean it up!!!!
Lisa Meyer	Plano	75023	We need better controls to ensure our environment survives
Cecily Sailer	Austin	78745	We need strong regulations for produced water.
Mary Triana	San Antonio	78261	We need to study the water to see if these chemicals can really be removed and if it is safe to drink. We must not assume; we need data before people start drinking this
Craig Nazor	Austin	78758	What is in produced water? Industry is allowed to hide the list of chemicals they put into it. More chemicals, plus radioactivity may get added by natural processes underground. If you don't know what's in the water, how can you know whatever you do with it is safe? This needs to be discussed! If we can't know for sure, then how do we know for sure we're not poisoning the environment, groundwater and the people of Texas?
Joseph Fleming	Austin	78752	Your charter is to protect everyone, not just business!
Beverly Lynn	Houston	77040	
Greg Bard	Manor	78653	
Marcia Curry	Alamo	78516	
Janet Clemenson	Houston	77003	
Eric Casey	Plano	75075	
Margaret Walden	Spring	77379	

Michael Bonagurio	Austin	78727	
Fr. Dennis Schafer, OFM	San Antonio	78214	
Pamela Miller	Tolar	76476	
Chris Mendoza	Dallas	75234	
Pat Garcia	Austin	78702	
Elizabeth Hall	Conroe	77384	
Kristy Mitchell	Early	76802	
Ishan George	Sunnyvale	75182	
Sarah De Sousa	Spring Branch	78070	
Analyn Urpi	Plano	75024	
Katira Tejeda	Mckinney	75071	
Kara Huff	Savannah	76227	
Evelyn Adams	McKinney	75071	
Analisa Crandall	Adkins	78101	
Patricia Jones	Corpus Christi	78413	
Sandra Lamont	Beaumont	77706	
Eleanor Jordan	Austin	78734	
Doreen Smithwick	Carrollton	75007	
Jim Anderson	Garland	75044	
Laura Long	Cedar Creek	78612	
Mark Bedgood	Corsicana	75110	
Paul Breaux	Leander	78641	
Wendy Webber	Bryan	77803	
Marce Walsh	Houston	77066	
Kathy Newman	San Antonio	78250	
Joanne Kendrick	Plano	75024	
Michael Spencer	Tioga	76271	
Thomas Wolfsohn	San Marcos	78666	

Robert Milton Bohmfalk	Seguin	78155	
Judy Lopato	Austin	78759	
Cheri Cowart	Austin	78723	
Robert Kelley	Conroe	77304	
Michael Murphy	Mason	76856	
Sharon Shircliff	San Juan	78589	
Kelly Epstein	Spring	77379	
Cindy Engel	Dallas	75238	
Lisa Stone	Houston	77096	
Kathleen Alexander	Alpine	79830	
Elizabeth Sharpe-Aparicio	College Station	77845	
Kim George	Desoto	75115	
Kendra Coleman	McKinney	75072	
L M	Cypress	77433	
Brant Kotch	Houston	77024	
Bo Baggs	Port Arthur	77642	
Peter Steitz	College Station	77845	
Linda Hanratty	Fort Worth	76109	
Celeste Beavers	Duncanville	75137	
Annalisa Peace	San Antonio	78212	
Wendy Gonzales	WIMBERLEY	78676	
Maverick Fisher	Austin	78741	
Tommy Joaquin Hancock	Austin	78704	
John Lundborg	Frisco	75036	
Jnenifer Holburn	Dallas	75238	

Leslie Smith	San Marcos	78666	
Erica Salas	Del Rio	78840	
Ling Zhu	Austin	78748	
Marjorie Lucey	San Antonio	78230	
Marie Sophia Vassilakidis	Houston	77057	
Peter Monie	San Antonio	78232	
Michael Miller	League City	77573	
Patrick BOOT	Dallas	75229	
Sherri Doiron	Royse City	75189	
Sarah Williams	La Grange	78945	
Phillip Kopita	Dallas	75225	
Robin Gelston	Harlingen	78552	
Gemma Mehalchick	Livingston	77399	
Lupita Sanchez	Brownsville	78526	
Claire Morris	Austin	78722	
Gary Elbow	Lubbock	79410	
Darya Krutyeva	Austin	78758	
Kevin Schroder	Houston	77007	
Deborah Kirk	Denison	75020	
Tom Wilbanks	Dallas	75243	
Kyle Cielencki	Dallas	75204	
Gordon Klein	Dickinson	77539	
Jim Klein	Corpus Christi	78411	
William OBrien	San Antonio	78216	
Christy A Morris	Lufkin	75901	
Dallas Windham	Fort Worth	76123	
Thomas Miller	Dallas	75227	
Brittany Hall	Lufkin	75904	

Thomas Moore	Houston	77084	
Neal Stucki	Austin	78729	
Sandra Palacios	Austin	78704	
Yareli Ortega	Fort Worth	76106	
Chelsea Burns	Dallas	75205	
Rosalva Guzman	Brownsville Tx	78520	
Lisa Brenskelle	Houston	77004	
Ellen Ranney	San Antonio	78212	
Charles Hobbs	Dallas	75218	
Sarah Sudheer	Austin	78750	
Richard Newhouse	Austin	78738	
Chandra Srivastava	Austin	78739	
Ellen Kaner	Arlington	76001	
Andres Venegas	El Paso	79912	
Robin Gelston	Harlingen	78552	
Jimmy L Kosclski	Missouri City	77459	
Morita Bruce	Austin	78717	
Dawn West	Sutherland Springs	78161	
Janice Phillips	Brenham	77833	