

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

| |
|--|
| As of: 1/9/18 10:56 AM Received: December 27, 2017 Status: Posted Posted: January 09, 2018 Tracking No. 1k1-9016-lerf Comments Due: January 09, 2018 Submission Type: Web |
|--|

Docket: MSHA-2014-0031
 Exposure of Underground Miners to Diesel Exhaust

Comment On: MSHA-2014-0031-0076
 Exposure of Underground Miners to Diesel Exhaust: Request for Information; Reopening of Rulemaking Record; Extension of Comment Period

Document: MSHA-2014-0031-0157
 Comment from a a, NA

Submitter Information

Name: a a
Organization: NA

General Comment

Obama administration agencies added more than \$80 billion of regulatory burden on the American economy in just 8 years of his term, hurting the poor in America and based on erroneous reports.

A 2014 a past EPA person acknowledged that EPA's enforcement philosophy was to "crucify" the oil and gas industry. Political motives, it is clear investigations were used to test the limits of the Agency's enforcement authority over the oil and gas industry and was an attempt to defame hydraulic fracturing. Consequently, EPA received significant scrutiny from the state, Congress, numerous stakeholders, and even EPA's own scientists over the justification. an EPA environmental chemist, sent an email to other EPA staff shortly before a EAO was issued saying "this is not conclusive evidence because of the limited data set...the only way now to compare the data would be to make assumptions to fill in data gaps and I don't believe we have enough experience at this site or data to do this at this time. EPA's "designated representative" in a legal deposition, stated that the EPA had not determined a gas and oil company caused or contributed to natural gas in the water, that the EPA had knowledge of naturally occurring methane gas in the local water, and that EPA did "no geologic investigation" to substantiate their claims. Similar to EPA's backtrack in another investigation, withdrew the EAO April 2012. Internal communications obtained by the Senate Committee reveal how EPA set aside facts to play politics in a case.

In December 2011, In EPA draft report on groundwater and Hydraulic fracturing the findings were inaccurate and not the result of properly conducted hydraulic fracturing. EPA ignored the

AB86-COMM-100

scientific process and manipulated its findings, failing to consult with the USGS or even the state before releasing the report. EPA ignored data that documented naturally occurring substances in groundwater, used incomplete data sets, and disregarded USGS sampling recommendations. In fact, EPA breached its internal policy for drilling groundwater monitoring wells. Accordingly, the draft report received numerous criticisms by the state, Congress, and other federal agencies. Even BLM criticized EPA's draft report, writing that the "data presented thus far seems to be at a scale and resolution insufficient to answer the questions this investigation raises," and that "bias in the samples obtained from these wells may exist. Looking back, it is clear that from the beginning of the investigation, the Obama Administration did not bother to get the science or facts right, nor did they come into Pavillion to make a constructive impact on the long history of drinking water issues for the people. They simply wanted to use the case as an opportunity to publicly "finger-point", and link hydraulic fracturing to water contamination, regardless of the facts. After extending the comment period on the draft report three times, the Agency eventually abandoned its investigation in June 2013. EPA failed approach to link contaminated water to Hydraulic fracturing . First case EPA recanted took place in Dimock, Pennsylvania where environmental activists first made accusations about potential groundwater contamination in December 2011. Despite ongoing state actions, and EPA's agreement with Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection that the water in Dimock was safe to drink, EPA soon moved forward under its Superfund authority and sampled 60 private wells in the area. These additional samplings prompted the media to assume there was still a major threat to drinking water from hydraulic fracturing, even though authorities had already deemed it safe. Unfortunately for the Agency and its political agenda, the facts held true and led EPA to both declare the water was safe to drink and confirm state officials' findings that there were no health concerns . The Agency released three rounds of testing that found no contamination and explained the substances found were naturally occurring and common to the area. After the Agency's fourth round of testing found no contamination, EPA ceased its fifth inquiry in July 2012.