

Emily Krajack
1155 Nimble Hill Road
Mehoopany PA 18629
570-637-0972
daisyodella@yahoo.com

December 5, 2016

ecomment@pa.gov

Technical Guidance Coordinator
Department of Environmental Protection
Policy Office
Rachel Carson State Office Building
POB 2063
Harrisburg PA 17105-2063

Re: 800-0810-002 Policy for the Replacement or Restoration of Private Water Supplies Impacted by Unconventional Operations

Dear Sir/Madam:

The technical guidance document leaves too much opportunity to result in the water supply owner hanging dealing with the issue themselves. For example, impacted supplies beyond the presumptive zone are not promptly provided with water. Thus, the water supply owner has immediate needs which they must address themselves. Water costs money. Should the operator be proved negligent a reimbursement of these expenses from the get go is appropriate.

The technical guidance document notes that *“the temporary water replacement is only acceptable for a period approved by the department in writing.”* Perhaps past experience has illustrated that this is a variable period. Unfortunately, this writer doesn't have this information any more than the owner of the impacted water supply. The department needs to define how long this period would extend. It must not be vague enough to allow operators to delay solving the problem.

The temporary water supply connected to the home's plumbing if necessary must provide for plumbing alterations to meet the medical needs of any person in the household requiring certain modifications. For example, chlorinated water may require an in-home filtration for certain medical conditions.

I object to the factor of cost being a limiting factor to water restoration. The operator for all intents and purposes “broke” the supply and so they need to permanently fix it – and

fix it within the requirements of the law. These operators are making millions of dollars off their exploitation of natural gas. It is well known that they are ripping off royalties and they do not pay their fair share of taxes. None of this reflects the sweet bargain of a deal many landowners expected. The least, and it is the least, these operators can do is properly fix the permanent water supply of those they impact. It's tiresome to continually read or see in action the reckless or devoted manner they follow to protect their own interests and the rest be damned.

Thank you for including the water supply owner in the preliminary consultation. They do need to be fully informed and an active party in the replacement process decisions. I further suggest adding the option, should a water supply owner desire, to bring their own consultant (qualified water quality specialist/geologist, etc.) to the preliminary consultation. The department may have different staff members throughout this process. The department's role is for environmental protection. The unconventional oil and gas regulations are established for environmental protection rather than public health. The water supply owner if they so choose, need to have the option to bring a consultant who is equipped to understand their particular health needs in regards to an impaired water supply and steps to correct it. It may become daunting to a water supply owner who is unaccustomed to dealing with large bureaucracies and has experienced dealing with the operator's representatives. The department will have their specialists, PE's PG's available to protect the environment, the industry will have their EHS specialists, PE's PG's and possibly even their lawyers present to protect their interests. If the water supply owner desires to bring a consultant to the meeting at their own expense they need to have that option.

New wells drilled in the same aquifer as an impacted water supply, which targets the same water bearing zones, will be viewed as a restorative course of action and not as a new water source for replacement purposes.

New wells drilled in the same aquifer as the impacted water supply is a ludicrous idea. They are not appropriate and under no circumstances need the department consider them appropriate. It would be no surprise for some operator to attempt to pull such a reckless action.

The TGD does not indicate whether or not the water supply owner receives a copy of the sample plan. At the very least, should a water supply owner request a copy they need to be provided a copy.

In regards to operational costs of the permanent system, the operator needs to bear those costs 100%. There must not be any reference to say, a statute in the coal mining program as this is the oil and gas program. There are clearly different water supply

impacts with each exploitation and they are different programs. The TGDs or regulations must not be co-mingled. A permanent water supply is exactly that, it is permanent to that/those home/s. Thus, as long as the water supply exists the operator must assume and be responsible for all future operating and maintenance costs, no matter who owns the home/s. Of course, the option is always there where they impact water supplies; they can purchase the homes. It's been done.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the TGD for unconventional oil and gas drilling water restoration. It is my hope that this document only be further altered to the point of it being more stringent.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Emily Krafjack".

Emily Krafjack